THE PASSION WEEK

BS2425
.B94

Library of The Theological Seminary

PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY

PRESENTED BY
The Estate of the
Rev. John B. Wiedinger

BS2425
.B94

THE PASSION WEEK

THE PASSION WEEK

DAY BY DAY

A Handbook for Ministers, Laymen and Study Groups

By
WALTER E. BUNDY
DePauw University

Willett, Clark & Colby
Chicago : 440 South Dearborn Street
New York : 200 Fifth Avenue
1930

Copyright 1930 by
WILLIETT, CLARK & COLBY

Manufactured in The U. S. A. by The Plimpton Press
Norwood, Mass.-La Porte, Ind.

The Bible text used in this volume is taken from the American Standard Version of the Revised Bible, copyright, 1929, by the International Council of Religious Education, and used by permission.

RAYMOND

in memoriam

CONTENTS

PREFACE

INTRODUCTION · 1

I. PALM SUNDAY · 13

II. MONDAY · 37

III. TUESDAY · 53

IV. WEDNESDAY · 89

V. THURSDAY · 111

VI. GOOD FRIDAY · 117
Scene I. At the Table

VII. GOOD FRIDAY · 141
Scene II. Gethsemane

VIII. GOOD FRIDAY · 155
Scene III. The Jewish Trial

IX. GOOD FRIDAY · 173
Scene IV. The Roman Trial

X. GOOD FRIDAY · 191
Scene V. The Crucifixion

EPILOGUE · 215
The Easter Adversative

PREFACE

THIS book is not intended as a substitute for a study of the New Testament story of the passion week. On the contrary, its plan and purpose is to promote an actual study of the Gospel passages concerned. It offers itself simply as a first handbook to guide the general reader in such study. At the beginning of each chapter there is a clear and orderly outline of the Gospel passages which should be read and studied in connection with the running comments here presented.

This book does not pretend to state or to solve the critical problems that arise out of the Gospel accounts of the passion week. The professional student is acquainted with the scholarly contributions in this field; he knows the problems and has perhaps his own solutions. Many matters, major and minor, of interest to the critical student are here simply passed over. The general reader is not interested in such academic matters, but he may find profit in a simpler study such as this handbook seeks to offer.

The interest here does not center in any of the many theological interpretations of the words and incidents in the closing scenes and days. Its quest of meanings is more simple — namely, to apprehend and appreciate the human, dramatic and religious elements that have gone into the making of the story. The passion narrative is a very human story; it brings a particular life to a close. The whole account has its dramatic qualities; it is moving, engaging, full of action and interest, tense in its emotions and tragic in its events. The drama is religious: a prophet of God and his kingdom, a holy city, a sacred festival, a pious pilgrimage, devout people, priestly opponents. In it we seek very simply for a clear comprehension of the actual human tragedy that was enacted in Jerusalem around 30 A.D.

W. E. B.

GREENCASTLE, INDIANA

MARCH 1, 1930

THE PASSION WEEK

INTRODUCTION

FROM the very beginnings of Christianity no section of the story of Jesus has commanded so much and such intense interest as the passion week. There is something growing and gripping in the account of the Jerusalem events which climax in Jesus' suffering and death. This is clear in the letters of Paul whose thought centers on the dramatic outcome rather than on what preceded and led up to it. Paul may have been thoroughly familiar with other sections of the story of Jesus — the Sermon on the Mount, the Beatitudes, the Lord's Prayer, the Golden Rule, the parables, the Galilean conflicts, the ministry of healing — he probably was, but he never makes specific reference to any of them. His Christian hope and faith center upon the cross and the resurrection, upon the religious significance which he and the earliest Christians generally have discovered in them. From the first century down to the present these two things, the cross and the resurrection, have constituted the paradoxical poles of Christian piety.

This predominant interest in the closing days and scenes is equally clear in the Gospels themselves. Five of the fifteen chapters (11–15) which Mark devotes to the public life of Jesus deal with the events of the passion week

— approximately one third of his Gospel. Luke's account of these last days is fully as extensive as that of Mark. The passion narratives of Matthew and the Fourth Gospel are even more elaborate.

In our study of the passion week, however, we may not sever it entirely from what has gone before, for it is a natural and integral part of the whole. Although we cannot trace exactly all the chronological bonds and causal connections that lead up to it, nevertheless the passion week is simply the climax of the drama that began in Galilee and that culminated in Jerusalem. The passion week must be regarded as the natural culmination of Jesus' religious life and mission. The Jesus who dies in the Holy City is the same Jesus that wrought and taught in Galilee. There is really no substantial change in him or in what he seeks to accomplish. The Jerusalem message is not altered in theme; it is the same imminent kingdom of God. Only the tone of his utterances becomes a bit sharper — a perfectly natural thing in view of the circumstances of bitter opposition and the prospect of impending catastrophe. His original religious faith and feeling, hope and outlook, hold him fast to the very end.

The Jerusalem days with their dramatic developments enrich and enhance much that has gone before. In Jerusalem we see that Jesus is ready to die, and does die, for the cause of God of which he has been and is the champion. In the last scenes he makes final declarations of the faith that has held him from the first. A new and glorious light falls over his personality and character. We realize fully the utter seriousness with which Jesus takes the things he has been teaching about what matters most in the sight of God and in the lives of men — faith, loyalty, love, obedience, hope, forgiveness, confidence and trust in adversity. We learn that for him all these things are more than moral and religious maxims. The Galilean teachings on prayer, for example, take on a new and deeper meaning when in Gethsemane and on the cross we hear Jesus praying and petitioning God in the bitterest hours of his life.

. . . . .

Mark's story of Jesus' public activity, which furnishes the framework for the more elaborate accounts of Matthew and Luke, is relatively simple in its plan and development. Jesus' public life falls into two principal periods according to the scene in which he works — the Galilean period and the Judean period. Jesus begins his work in Galilee, the northern province of Palestine, and his public life ends with his death in Jerusalem. Thus there is just one chief shift in the scene of the story — from Galilee to Jerusalem.

THE GALILEAN PERIOD consumes by far the greater portion of Jesus' time in public — a number of months, approximately a year. The principal center of activity is the Sea of Galilee, especially its northwestern shore with headquarters in Capernaum. No sharp division can be made within the Galilean story, but Mark 7:24 seems to bring a turning-point. What precedes (1:2–7:23) may be called the earlier Galilean days; what follows (7:24–9:50), the later Galilean days.

The earlier Galilean days are filled with great publicity and popularity. Almost constantly Jesus is surrounded by great multitudes eager to hear his words or to witness his cures of the sick and afflicted. In this period we find conflicts with the religious authorities, especially the Pharisees. The issues have to do with Jesus' teaching and conduct, his failure to conform to tradition and convention in both. These conflicts are not serious in the sense that Jesus' life is endangered. During this period, too, we get the first hint of pressing personal problems which Jesus faces; they remain, however, more in the background. In the foreground of Jesus' thought and work is his message and mission as the called and commissioned prophet of the kingdom of God. He spends these earlier Galilean days in the presence of a large public, announcing his great message. The majority of his cures fall in this early period.

The later Galilean days open with Jesus taking an unexpected step — the journey to the north beyond the borders of his native land (Mark 7:24–30). During this period Jesus is still popular with the multitudes; he is still opposed by the Pharisees. He still announces his public message and effects some cures. But these outstanding features of the earlier Galilean days fall more into the background. There is less publicity. Jesus often seeks to avoid the multitudes or to escape them entirely. He is more in retirement, more alone with the twelve. The most important of his utterances are reserved for them in private. It is a period of restlessness with Jesus almost constantly on the move — to the region of Tyre and Sidon, to Mount Hermon, back and forth across the Sea of Galilee. During these last days in the northern province Jesus' personal problems come more to the front. Toward the close, if we may trust the representation of the first three Gospels, Jesus' thought develops out into a new direction; his words to the twelve in private take on a new tragic tone; for the first time the thought of a fatal outcome seems to lodge itself in his mind, yet with the approach of the Passover festival he determines to go up to the Holy City.

THE JUDEAN PERIOD might just as well be called the Jerusalem period for, with the exception of the things said and done on the way to the Holy City (Mark 10), all else transpires in Jerusalem and its immediate vicinity. This period is very brief in comparison with the Galilean period. It includes at most only the last few weeks of Jesus' life — the time necessary for the journey to Jerusalem and the six brief days of the passion week. During these last weeks Jesus continues to announce his message of the imminent kingdom. It, too, is a period of continued popularity with the people. In Jerusalem, however, Jesus strikes a new, more powerful and bitter opposition — the chief priests who oppose him for very different reasons than did the Pharisees in Galilee. They bring about Jesus' death within less than a week. During this period the former ministry of healing is all but gone. According to Mark, there is just one cure on the way to the Holy City, the blind man at the gates of Jericho, and no cures in Jerusalem itself. Jesus' personal problems now become struggles of soul; their nature is clearer than ever, and they reach their climax in Gethsemane. In Mark, Jesus dies in the throes of terrific inner conflict with a cry of distress, a prayer of protest, on his lips.

The Judean period opens with the journey to Jerusalem. It is an eventful journey; Mark devotes the whole of chapter ten to the account of it. Why did Jesus go to Jerusalem? Why did he venture upon this fatal step?

The Gospel writers very clearly present Jesus' purpose in the light of the outcome: he went to Jerusalem to die (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:32). Besides these formal forecasts of death ahead, other utterances of Jesus during the journey have a tragic note. There is the passion path for the disciples, renunciation of this world in view of rewards in the new order to come, the words on service and sacrifice. But this tragic note seems to have come from later Christian sentiment which interpreted Jesus' purpose in the light of the fact that the journey did result in his death. Further, this interpretation of Jesus' purpose had a spontaneous source in the religious meaning of the cross and the early Christian understanding of the divine plan of which it was the culmination. Jesus may have approached the Holy City with the thought of a fatal outcome in his mind, for in coming to Jerusalem he was entering the stronghold of an organized religion that had never been friendly to the prophets from the provinces. But there is no reason to suppose that the Jerusalem authorities were prepared for his coming or that they were on the lookout for him (John 7:11; 11:56–57). There is no indication that Jesus anticipated their bitter hostility. In the first days of the passion week the depressed mood that dominates the words on the way to Jerusalem fails to appear. Further, the conflict that resulted in his death did not antedate his appearance at the festival. It seems to have originated and matured on Jerusalem ground.

Others think that Jesus went to Jerusalem to continue the same sort of work that he had been doing in Galilee. It marked simply a shift in the scene of his ministry. There is considerable basis for this idea in the passion story itself. Once he is in the Holy City, Jesus speaks and acts with the old confidence and assurance, announcing his message of the kingdom, disputing with his opponents, all the while carried along by the enthusiasm of the people for what he says and does.

There seems to be, however, a more simple and natural reason for the journey to the Holy City. The passion story itself seems to disclose it. Jesus goes up at the time of the Passover; it is prepared for him; he says that he has anticipated it with great desire, and on the last night he celebrates it with his chosen group. Whether any special thing figured in Jesus' actual motives — death or a continuation of his work — we have no way of knowing. But in its simplest sense the journey seems to have been a pilgrimage to the Passover, and Jesus, like thousands of pious Jews, is a pilgrim to the most sacred of his people's religious festivals. The journey climaxes in the Bethany demonstration — an ovation, it seems, by the Galilean Passover pilgrims in his honor.

The passion week itself includes only six days — Sunday to Friday. This is the extent of Jesus' Jerusalem ministry in the first three Gospels — an amazingly short space of time. But in spite of its brevity the Gospel writers treat it with equally surprising fulness and detail. The first three days (Sunday, Monday, Tuesday) are spent in public; the second three days are in private (Wednesday, Thursday, Friday), the closing scenes becoming public with Jesus no longer a free but condemned man.

The account of this last week is really a drama. There is a general gist and plot running through the whole: on Palm Sunday comes the Bethany demonstration; on Monday, the cleansing of the temple; on Tuesday, the conflicts and discourses; on Wednesday, the anointing in Bethany and Judas' betrayal; on Thursday, the preparation of the Passover; on the Jewish Friday, beginning with our Thursday evening, the supper scene, the Gethsemane struggle, the arrest, trials and crucifixion. The story is told with remarkable simplicity and dignity. There is throughout a delicateness of sentiment, a fascinating fineness of feeling; a deep pathos pervades the whole.

Only in Mark can we follow Jesus day by day. Matthew and Luke do not make a careful division into days in each case. An event that Mark assigns to a particular day Matthew or Luke, or both, may include on another or on no special day. In all of the first three Gospels the passion week opens with Jesus' arrival in the Holy City and the Bethany demonstration. Mark (11:1) brings this first day to a definite close in 11:11. He notes the beginning of the second day in 11:12; of the third in 11:20; of the fourth in 14:1; of the fifth in 14:12; and the sixth in 14:17. Matthew, like Mark, brings the first day (21:1) to a definite close in 21:17 and the beginning of the second day he notes in 21:18. The second and third days (21:18–25:46) he does not separate the one from the other. The fourth day opens with 26:1–2; the fifth with 26:17; the sixth with 26:20. In his parallels to Mark's first three days Luke (19:29–21:36) notes no beginnings or endings of particular days; in 21:37–38 he characterizes the Jerusalem activity thus far as teaching every day in the temple with the nights spent outside the city on the Mount of Olivet. Luke's last three days are clear although he is not numbering them. In Luke 22:1 we are parallel with the beginning of Mark's fourth day; in 22:7 with the fifth; and in 22:14 with the sixth. In the Fourth Gospel the calendar of the passion week disappears entirely. In 12:1 we are six days before the Passover; in 12:13 we are on the morrow; and in 13:1 on the last night of Jesus' life.

A number of scholars are skeptical about Mark's clear-cut division into six days. They find his calendar scheme to be a superficial and artificial arrangement; for them, it appears as a later and secondary addition forced upon the materials. The fact that Luke shows no interest in a definite chronology, they think, demonstrates this. They find the Jerusalem period too short, a total of six days with only three in public, and these far too crowded.

Whether Mark's chronological scheme has any historical value we cannot say definitely. We may not be sure of particular incidents falling on particular days. We may not be sure even that all the things reported as a part of the passion week actually belonged to it. The anointing of Jesus is a striking example. Matthew and Mark assign it to Wednesday of this last week, but Luke includes it as a part of his Galilean story (7:36–50). In the Fourth Gospel it precedes the Passover by six days (12:1–8) instead of by two days as in Matthew and Mark. Even the date of Jesus' death is uncertain. In the midst of all sorts of historical difficulties and other improbabilities the first three Gospels have Jesus die on the most sacred feast day in the Jewish calendar, on the first day of the feast of unleavened bread — the fifteenth of the Jewish month of Nisan. The Fourth Gospel, however, dates Jesus' death twenty-four hours earlier, on the fourteenth of Nisan — a date that is not burdened with all the difficulties and improbabilities that beset the fifteenth.

All of these problems admit of a great deal of scholarly speculation, but as yet there is no definite solution. About the best we can do is to take the conflicting chronology as we find it, noting all along the problems that confront it. The most crowded day of the six is Tuesday. Otherwise, the problem has to do not so much with the crowded character of the days as with such important and far-reaching events falling within the brief space of six days.

The question of the general historical reliability of the Gospel reports of the passion week is not essentially different from the bearing this question has on the whole of the Gospel story. There are fewer traces perhaps of personal memory than appear at certain points in the Galilean account. The eyewitness theory for these closing scenes must be definitely abandoned sooner or later, for the marks of personal reminiscence have been effaced in a wide and vigorous circulation. Those fresh, first-hand features that suggest actual participation in the events are missing.

In the passion story we have to do with a social or group product, the story as commonly known and generally circulated among the early Christian communities. At no point in the Gospel story are the primitive Christian interests and interpretations more prominent. The whole is conceived and presented from the community point of view; not a few passages reflect very clearly primitive Christian cult and practices. Certain features and phases of the story appear as secondary and acquired. There are some legendary accretions. Very seldom do we find matter wholly free from later Christian revision.

Our general historical orientation for the study of the passion week is the same that holds for the study of the life of Jesus as a whole. Jesus is a Jewish prophet working among his Jewish contemporaries on Jewish soil. We must think, then, of the passion week in Jewish terms, just as Jewish as possible. The whole of the passion week, with its drama and its tragedy, develops around a Jewish festival and its celebration. Jesus, his disciples and the Galilean crowds generally are pilgrims to the Passover. The scene and setting, the actors in the story, the issues involved — all are Jewish.[1]

---

[1] For highly valuable comments on the passion week from the modern Jewish point of view, liberal and orthodox, *see:* Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels* (2d edition, New York: Macmillan, 1927); Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth* (New York: Macmillan, 1925). An ultra-liberal Jewish picture of Jesus is Enelow's *A Jewish View of Jesus* (New York: Macmillan, 1920).

CHAPTER I

PALM SUNDAY

PALM SUNDAY

	Matthew	Mark	Luke	
1 The Bethany Demonstration [a]	21:1–9	11:1–10	19:29–38	
2 The Protest of the Pharisees [b]	....	....	39–40	*Mt 21:15–16*
3 The Prophecy of the Fall of Jerusalem	....	....	41–44	
4 The Entry into the Holy City	10–11	11a	....	
5 In the Temple — Observations	12a	11b	45a	
6 The Cleansing of the Temple [c]	12b–13	....	45b–46	*Mk 11:15–17*
7 The Blind and Lame Cured in the Temple	14	....	....	
8 The Protest of the Chief Priests	15–16	....	....	*Lk 19:39–40*
9 The Return to Bethany	17	11c	....	

[a] John 12:12–18.

[b] John 12:19.

[c] John 2:13–17.

THE first day of the passion week is set off clearly in both Matthew (21:1–17) and Mark (11:1–11). In 11:11 Mark tells us that it is evening and that Jesus returns to Bethany with the twelve. Matthew (21:17) notes the return to Bethany and in 21:18 we are on the morning of the second day. Luke, however, does not note the close of the first day nor the beginning of the second. Nevertheless, he seems to depict the events in 19:29–46 as following in rapid succession and without intervening nights or retreats from the city. Certainly Luke presents the cleansing as coming on the first day on the first visit to the temple.

A glance at the outline of events for this first day (opposite page) shows that it is considerably more eventful in Matthew and Luke than it is in Mark. This is due to the fact that the first and third Evangelists each has his own special materials which he assigns to this day. Further, both report the cleansing of the temple on Palm Sunday which, in Mark, is the principal event of the second day.

1. *THE BETHANY DEMONSTRATION.*

Matthew 21:1–9. *Mark* 11:1–10. *Luke* 19:29–38.

Palm Sunday opens in all of the first three Gospels with one and the same incident — the Bethany demonstration. It is the principal event of the day, the one from which it gets its name, and the only one which all three writers agree in assigning to this particular day. The date of the Bethany demonstration is not so clear in the Fourth Gospel (12:12–19). It comes on the day following (12:12) the anointing in Bethany (12:1–8) which is dated as six days before the Passover.

In the first three Gospels the Bethany demonstration is vitally associated with what precedes. It is the climax of the eventful journey to Jerusalem.[1] Jesus and his disciples have come up from Galilee by the way of Jericho for the first and only visit to the Holy City during his public career. They are approaching the Mount of Olives over which (II Samuel 15:30) the road from Jericho to Jerusalem led and from which the pilgrims were wont to catch the first view of Zion and its sacred walls.

In the Fourth Gospel, however, the Bethany demonstration is not associated with a journey from Galilee to the Holy City. Although the Fourth Evangelist has Jesus go up from Galilee to Jerusalem three different times (2:13; 5:1; 7:10) during his public life, there is no eventful journey to the Holy City in his account, no pilgrimage culminating in the ovation on the Mount of Olives. According to the Fourth Gospel Jesus came out from the Holy City to Bethany only the day before (12:1), and he is leaving Bethany for the Holy City again when the demonstration takes place (12:12).

---

[1] Matt. 19–20; Mark 10; Luke 9:51–19:28.

The account opens in the first three Gospels with Jesus nearing the Holy City, a dramatic moment in the experience of any pilgrim, with the villages of Bethphage and Bethany just ahead. According to all three, too, he sends two of his disciples to the villages ahead to fetch a colt. It is at this point that Matthew makes his principal departure from the accounts of Mark and Luke.

Matthew gives Jesus' instructions for the finding and bringing of the colt, but in Mark and Luke his words are not of the nature of instructions but of detailed predictions concerning what the disciples will find, what will be said to them and what they in turn shall reply. Thus, Mark and Luke introduce a mysterious, miraculous element and both emphasize the fact that the disciples found everything just as Jesus had said that they would — a miracle of omniscience.

Matthew, however, eliminates this miraculous element. He omits the detailed fulfilment of the predictions in Mark 11:5–6. Instead, he emphasizes the fact that " the disciples went and did even as Jesus appointed them." (Matt. 21:6.) Thus, the account of the incident in the first Gospel becomes less mysterious and baffling. Matthew has another interest in this preliminary stage not evident in Mark or Luke: the finding of the colt is a fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy — Isaiah 62:11 and Zechariah 9:9.

This preliminary stage in the Bethany incident leaves an unfavorable impression. How can Jesus know and predict all of these complicated details when, according to all of the first three Gospels, this is his first visit to Jerusalem during his public career? In the Fourth Gospel, in which Jesus has been almost constantly in and about Jerusalem and only the day before has come out to Bethany, this sending for the colt with specific instructions would not be surprising. But the Fourth Evangelist omits this preliminary stage entirely and has Jesus himself find the colt (12:14), however, only after the demonstration has taken place (12:12–13)—a sort of anticlimax.

All of the first three Gospels leave with us the impression that Jesus himself sets the stage for the Bethany demonstration. He conceives it, plans it and enlists two of his disciples in its preparation. A prompt skepticism, based on all that we know of Jesus, confronts this clear impression coming straight from the accounts as they now stand. We cannot fit such a picture and purpose into the total temper of his personality. It is difficult to imagine Jesus staging anything, particularly a demonstration in his own honor.

The fetching of the colt appears to be secondary and acquired, a later outgrowth of the story that would enhance the miraculous element. The original demonstration was unplanned, unprepared, by Jesus or others. It was one of those things that are born of the moment, that cannot be foreseen. A definite plan in advance would contradict the spontaneous nature of the ovation that follows. The original account was probably more simple and may have read somewhat as follows:

"And when they drew nigh unto Jerusalem, unto Bethphage and Bethany, at the Mount of Olives, . . . they found a colt (at the door without in the open street); and they loose him. . . . And they bring the colt unto Jesus, and cast on him their garments; and he sat upon him. And many spread their garments upon the way; and others branches, which they had cut from the fields. And they that went before, and they that followed, cried, Hosanna; Blessed *is* he that cometh in the name of the Lord: Blessed *is* the kingdom that cometh, *the kingdom* of our father David: Hosanna in the highest."

This more simple account preserves better what must have been the original spontaneous character of the incident. The fetching of the colt appears as a later embellishment derived perhaps from a subsequent Markan incident — the preparation of the Passover.[2] The two preparations are really parallel companion pieces, not only in their mysterious character but in their details.

In the demonstration itself we get the impression of a triumphal procession. Matthew (21:9) and Mark (11:9) seem to have a formation in mind — Jesus mounted in the center of the column, some of the crowd going before him, others following. In Luke the demonstration goes through two definite stages: the spreading of the garments in the way,[3] with the shouts of the crowd bursting forth only at the descent of the Mount of Olives when the city comes into view (19:37). In Matthew and Mark the spreading of the garments and the branches in the way and the cries of the crowd are simultaneous.

---

[2] Matt. 26:17–19; Mark 14:12–16; Luke 22:7–13.

It is these festal features that the Christian imagination has always associated with Palm Sunday. It is interesting to note, however, that the palms are mentioned only in the Fourth Gospel (12:13). In Jewish practice the palms were displayed at the feast of Tabernacles, not at the Passover. In our ecclesiastical calendar the palms have always symbolized the triumphant element which the Christian mind has discovered not only in this incident but in the whole of the life and work of Jesus. The spreading of garments in a hero's path is a characteristic act of oriental homage. (II Kings 9:13.) In fact, the attitude, actions and utterances of the crowd suggest the reception of a conquering hero.

What is the meaning of this incident? How shall we interpret this enthusiastic outburst?

The great difficulty that confronts us in interpreting the Bethany demonstration is the fact that it is already interpreted by the Gospel writers. All of them quite plainly regard it as messianic for all involved. The people are publicly acclaiming Jesus as the Messiah. There is the messianic mount of prophecy (Zech. 9:9), the acts of homage, the Psalm extracts with a messianic ring to them. Jesus here for this one time at least, independent of what precedes and what follows, allows himself to be acclaimed publicly the Messiah. Christians generally of subsequent generations and centuries have shared this sentiment of the Gospel writers: Here at the very close, at least for one brief day, Jesus is accepted and acclaimed as the One he really is!

---

[3] Luke omits the "branches" of Matthew and Mark.

But when we begin to attempt to relate this messianic interpretation to all that has gone before and to all that follows, we are confronted with grave difficulties. What are the antecedents that would lead up to a messianic meaning either for the crowds or for Jesus? If this is a public messianic proclamation, how shall we relate it to the Jerusalem events that follow?

Who are these people? Whence do these crowds come? Their identity must have some bearing on the meaning of their actions and utterances and throw some light on their relationship to Jesus. The Fourth Gospel has a motley multitude — some are Passover pilgrims already arrived in the Holy City (12:12); others have witnessed his maximum wonder-work, the raising of Lazarus (17); others are those who have only heard of this resurrection from the dead (18). It is important to note that the Fourth Evangelist's crowd comes out from the Holy City. Even the pilgrims to the feast are already in Jerusalem; they have not been in Jesus' company during the long journey from Galilee. All come out to meet Jesus as he returns to the Holy City after a day and a night in Bethany.

In the first three Gospels the situation is wholly different. The crowds are Galileans on their way to Jerusalem; they are Jesus' fellow-pilgrims to the Passover. They have been in his company — better perhaps, he in theirs — throughout the eventful journey to the Holy City. They appeared first when he left Galilee for the region east of the Jordan. (Mark 10:1.) They were with him passing through Jericho (10:46), and now with him they descend the Mount of Olives into the city itself.

When we think of these crowds as Galileans, such as they are represented in the first three Gospels, it is difficult to read a messianic meaning into their actions and utterances. The usual attitude of the Galilean public that we have met, wherever it has expressed itself, has been to the effect that Jesus is a prophet and that he is honored as such. (Mark 6:15; 8:28.) If suddenly they have come to the messianic conviction concerning him, how and what has brought the change about? His words and works on the way up from the north country have not been essentially different for the general public from the things said and done in Galilee. How is it that the messianic dignity of their prophet would suddenly dawn upon them only when he and they are off their native soil? If a messianic meaning now captures the Galilean mind, how shall we explain its fickleness or lack of courage in crisis? How is it that these Galileans hail Jesus as God's chosen Messiah on Palm

Sunday and less than a week later never raise a finger in his behalf when he is caught in the coils of the death process?

Really the attitude of the Galileans here on the Mount of Olives is not substantially different from what it has always been. To be sure, this is the first instance of public ovation and homage. But the thronging of the multitudes back in Galilee, the eagerness with which they look and listen, their amazement at his words and deeds, the rapid spread of his fame, his futile efforts to be alone, their persistent pursuit of him — all of these things have the same public faith and feeling behind them that now expresses itself in a new manner on approaching the Holy City. Judging from the Jerusalem events that follow so rapidly, Jesus on the descent from the Mount of Olives remains for these enthusiastic Galileans the same puzzling person that he has always been, that he was when he taught and healed in their own countrysides and villages.

The incident at Bethany does not seem to have had a messianic meaning for Jesus personally. His words and actions on this occasion and later would not suggest a public messianic proclamation on his part. In Jerusalem he is the same prophet in word and deed that he was in Galilee. His actions and utterances acquire no new, messianic coloring. His attitude toward the messianic issue, wherever it appears, is essentially unchanged. In Jerusalem, as we shall see, he is seemingly as reserved and reticent as ever. If he sensed any messianic suggestions in what was said and done in the Bethany outburst, he simply let it pass, as usual, without comment or commitment on his part.

We cannot associate a messianic meaning of the Bethany demonstration with the general attitude of the Jerusalem authorities with whom Jesus promptly comes into conflict. It is indeed surprising that this demonstration, in which the Gospel writers discover so much, is without consequences in the eventful days that follow. It is never again referred to by Jesus or others, friend or foe. Even his bitterest enemies in the Holy City take no notice of it, and if it had had a messianic coloring they would hardly have overlooked it during those first three days when they were seemingly desperate to find matter that would furnish a case against him. If Jesus, with his Galilean *entourage,* had made a messianic entry into the Holy City, it certainly would not have been completely ignored in the trial where the messianic issue is the crux of both the Jewish and the Roman hearings.

unless the entry was lost in the hubbub of pilgrims going in to the city + was not as prominent as the Gospels make it appear!

If we look carefully into the Bethany incident and seek out its original setting — a Galilean prophet and Galilean pilgrims going up to the Holy City for the celebration of the most sacred of Jewish festivals, we see that nothing necessarily messianic is involved in what is said and done. The most impressive reconstruction, then, will be the most natural one, and the most natural meaning will be as Jewish as possible, for Jesus and these Galileans are Jews, all of them sharers of the deepest sentiments and hopes of Israel.

For centuries Jerusalem had been the center of Israel's religious life, and as the Holy City it symbolized all that was nearest and dearest to the Jewish heart in the way of devout hopes and fears. Here was the temple, the dwelling-place of Israel's God; here was its center of worship, its altars, its holy of holies. Here the great festivals were celebrated, and thither pious Jews from all parts of the known world found their way, pilgrims to Jahwe's sanctuary. Especially among the Jews of the provinces this idealization of Zion lived on and the sacred spell that their pious fancy cast about the city kindly spared them the realistic side of the city's religious business and traffic. Every loyal son of Israel looked forward to his pilgrimage to the holy place.

These pilgrimages were often accomplished in high emotional tension, and as the city drew nearer and nearer feeling increased. The first glimpse of its sacred walls was a dramatic moment. From the Mount of Olives Galileans and others coming up by way of Jericho caught their first view. At this moment the tense feelings found release in prophetic passages and song. Certain of the Psalms, praising Zion and celebrating the loveliness of its towers and walls, seem to have been born at this moment, expressing the emotions of the pious pilgrim from the provinces when first he sights the Zion of God.

The Gospel account of the Bethany demonstration seems to have behind it this simpler Jewish demonstration. We seem to have here the usual outburst of pilgrim song and psalm when the Holy City comes into view. The hosannas and the cries of the crowd would not compromise the Jewish character of the incident, for Jewish religious hopes and fears were always associated with God's chosen One. The Mount of Olives had its own messianic suggestions. According to Zechariah 14:4 Jehovah in his day will appear on the Mount of Olives. Josephus tells us that popular Jewish belief set the scene of the Messiah's appearance there.

This usual outburst of religious feeling may have turned into an unpremeditated demonstration in honor of Jesus. It would become, then, an outburst of patriotic and provincial pride. The Galileans honor him who for months now has been their very own prophet. That this personal element in honor of Jesus is prophetic, not messianic, is especially clear in the reply of the crowds on entering the city itself. (Matt. 21:11). Thus, the Galilean attitude toward Jesus on the Mount of Olives is not different from what it was at home. Off their common native soil, in strange and sacred surroundings, he appeared more than ever their very own.

Just all that this striking scene meant for Jesus, just all that the Galileans meant by it, we cannot say. But if we are seeking history, we must think of it in Jewish and Galilean terms rather than in terms of later Christian interpretation. It seems to have been only a variation of the usual demonstration on sighting the Holy City. But for the earliest Christians this scene was full of suggestions which writers and readers of the Gospels did not fail to catch. The belief in Jesus' messiahship, so far as we know, was universal among New Testament Christians and it has invaded the whole of the Christian story of his life and work — his words and deeds, major phases of his mission, principal features of his personality. Certainly no scene in the Gospels lent itself more promptly to this process of involuntary invasion than the Bethany demonstration, and there could be no real hope of escaping. John 12:16 probably gives us reliable history on this point: " These things understood not his disciples at the first: but when Jesus was glorified, then remembered they that these things were written of him, and that they had done these things unto him." The Bethany demonstration probably acquired its messianic coloring in the light of the Easter faith.

2. *THE PROTEST OF THE PHARISEES.*

Luke 19:39–40.

Matthew and Mark report only one incident on the Mount of Olives, the demonstration itself, with nothing intervening between it and the entry into the city. Luke, however, introduces two little scenes that take place after the demonstration and before the arrival in the city itself, our present passage and the following. (19:41–44.) This first scene takes the form of a protest against the demonstration. Mark has no such protest from any source. Matthew, however, has a parallel scene in 21:15–16 where the chief priests and the scribes protest against the cries of the children in the temple. The Fourth Gospel (12:19) reports a reaction of the Pharisees, a sort of sullen complaint among themselves.

It is interesting to note that the Pharisees who protest in Luke 19:39 regard the whole multitude as Jesus' followers: " Teacher, rebuke thy disciples." Jesus' reply (19:40) comes in the form of an exalted word such as now and then escapes his lips: " I tell you, if these shall hold their peace, the stones will cry out." In Luke, then, we might think of Jesus himself as caught away in the enthusiasm of the moment, but the nature of this utterance would not suggest that he is thinking of the outburst in the terms of his own personal honor. Jesus' word is genuinely Jewish. He himself shares the faith and feelings that stir the Galileans about him. The first sight of the Holy City must have meant as much to Jesus as to any Passover pilgrim and it aroused within him all that he hoped and believed, all that he preached and prayed for. In this word Jesus is still the Galilean prophet who feels the importance of the hour in which he lives.

3. *THE PROPHECY OF THE FALL OF JERUSALEM.*

Luke 19:41–44.

This is Luke's third scene on the Mount of Olives, the second which he inserts between the demonstration and the entry into the city which come immediately together in Matthew and Mark. According to Luke, Jesus is nearing the city; it is in full view, and he weeps over it. This passage would suggest that Jesus' thought on the Mount of Olives has been centered on the Holy City and that the demonstration must have had some primary association with its coming into view.

This is the first of a series of Zionistic passages which Luke alone ascribes to Jesus during these last days. Exactly the same theme with different treatment appears in the prophecy over the weeping daughters of Jerusalem on the way to the cross. (23:27–31.) Other words centering on the fate of Jerusalem we meet in Luke's form of the address on the last things. (21:20–22, 24.)

A number of scholars are skeptical about the genuineness of this passage. Others hold to it as a genuine word of Jesus. But the origin and history of such passages are difficult to determine because they are so general and represent a common ground on which prophetic Judaism, the religion of Jesus and primitive Christianity stood. Our present prophecy is generally Jewish rather than especially distinctive of Jesus. It has an Old Testament base, theme and tone.[4] The passage is true to the typical prophetic temper. Prophet-like, Jesus looks upon the Holy City, loves it, weeps over it and forecasts its fall.

[4] Cf. Isa. 29:3; 37:33; Jer. 6:6; Eccl. 9:14; Ezek. 4:2; 26:8.

4. *THE ENTRY INTO THE HOLY CITY.*

Matthew 21:10–11. *Mark* 11:11*a*.

Luke gives no actual notice of the entry into the city itself. He goes from the preceding prophecy when Jesus is nearing the city and weeps over it to the scene in the temple. The entry into the city itself Mark dismisses with a brief notice as though it were without incident.

In Matthew, however, the entry into Jerusalem forms a dramatic scene. The cheering that began at Bethany continues right down to the gates of the city and through the streets. All the city is disturbed by the demonstration, as it was by the news of his birth. (2:3–4.) This effect on the people of Jerusalem is enhanced in the Fourth Gospel. They hear the news of his coming; they do not await his arrival but go out to meet him. (12:12, 18.) But in the first three Gospels Jesus as a prophet with a public message and mission is a newcomer and a stranger. The Jerusalem people ask, "Who is this?" (Matt. 21:10.)

The reply of the Galileans is very interesting and throws light on the nature of the demonstration — "This is the prophet, Jesus, from Nazareth of Galilee." (21:11.) There is no hint of a messianic meaning and the Galilean attitude is the same in Jerusalem that it was at home: Jesus is a prophet, their prophet, and their demonstration is a spontaneous outburst of provincial pride. This prophetic estimate of Jesus appears again in Matthew 21:46. In fact, the general Jerusalem impression is the same that we meet in Galilee. It is Jesus' popularity as a prophet and teacher that protects him from his Jerusalem enemies and that eventually forces them to resort to speedy and secret action.

5. *IN THE TEMPLE — OBERVATIONS.*

Matthew 21:12*a*. *Mark* 11:11*b*. *Luke* 19:45*a*.

All three of the Synoptic writers agree that Jesus goes immediately to the temple on arriving in the Holy City. " This was the first duty of every Jew, from no matter what country, when he came to the feast of the Passover; we have a parallel in the visit to the ' Wailing Wall ' at the present day." [5] In the Fourth Gospel there is no notice of a visit to the temple in this connection for Jesus is not a Passover pilgrim coming up from Galilee as he is in the first three Gospels.

This prompt visit to the temple throws light perhaps on the real motive of Jesus in making the journey to Jerusalem. He came up as a pious pilgrim to the most sacred of the Jewish feasts. None of the Gospel writers tells us of an act of worship on Jesus' part, of the bringing of an offering, on this occasion or on the following days during which the temple is the principal scene of his activity. The only cult in which he participates is the Passover meal on the last night, and this was not associated with the temple.

Both Matthew and Luke omit Mark's notice, " when he had looked round about upon all things." In Mark this notice explains to the reader why Jesus does not act at once as he does in Matthew and Luke, and, as we shall see, it gives a very distinctive character to the act itself in Mark. It is deliberate, delayed, decisive.

---

[5] Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth,* p. 311. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company.

With this visit to the temple the first day of the passion week is really over in Mark. There remains only the notice of the nearness of evening and the return to Bethany. In Matthew and Luke, however, the day is not done. One of its two principal incidents comes next, the cleansing of the temple, and Matthew has two other notices beyond it before he tells of the return to Bethany.

6. *THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE.*

Matthew 21:12*b*–13. *Luke* 19:45*b*–46.

It is at this point that Matthew and Luke make their first principal departure from Mark's calendar of the passion week. Both report the cleansing of the temple as taking place on the same day as the triumphal entry and on the very first visit to the temple. In Mark a night in Bethany intervenes between the visit to the temple on the first day and the cleansing which becomes the principal event on the second day. This anticipation of the Markan arrangement by Matthew and Luke throws a special light on the nature of the act itself: on the first day on the first visit Jesus cleanses the temple. The act appears, then, as more spontaneous and temperamental, performed more on the spur of the moment. (Cf. p. 43 ff.)

With the cleansing of the temple the first day seems to be over in Luke. He takes no notice of the close of the day or of a departure from the city, but the events in 19:29–46 he has presented in continuous, unbroken narrative as though they followed in rapid succession. In his next notice (19:47a) he tells us that Jesus taught daily in the temple, and for the remainder of Jesus' public work in Jerusalem he has no clear division into definite days such as we find in Mark.

7. *THE BLIND AND LAME CURED IN THE TEMPLE.*

Matthew 21:14.

Matthew has two more scenes in the temple on Palm Sunday, our present passage and the following. This first has to do with the cure of blind and lame following immediately upon the cleansing. This notice is one of those general mentions of cures with no specific cases cited. It is interesting because it stands so isolated in the Jerusalem account. Mark has no notice of cures in Jerusalem, and with the exception of the cure at the gates of Jericho (10:46–52) all of Jesus' healing activity is confined to Galilee. The case is exactly the same in Matthew apart from this one notice of cures in the temple on Palm Sunday.[6] Luke has one specific case of cure in his Jerusalem story, the healing of the severed ear in Gethsemane. (22:51b.) He has no general mention of cures. On his long and eventful journey to Jerusalem (9:51–19:28) Luke reported five cures: the dumb demoniac (11:14) which Matthew assigned to Galilee (9:32–33; 12:22–23); two Sabbath cures (13:10–17; 14:1–6), both of which have a distinctly Galilean atmosphere about them; the ten lepers in the borders of Galilee and Samaria (17:11–19); finally, the Markan cure at the gates of Jericho (18:35–43).

---

[6] Both Matthew (21:18–19) and Mark (11:12–14) report the wonder worked on the barren fig tree.

The healing activity of Jesus, so prominent in Galilee, virtually disappears from the Jerusalem days. The time in the Holy City is, of course, very brief — only three days in public according to Mark. But even in Galilee there was clear from the first days in public a growing disinclination of Jesus to heal. In the latter half of the Galilean period the cures became less and less frequent. In Galilee Jesus was known as a teacher and healer. In Jerusalem, however, his reputation as a healer does not come to light and he is generally known during this brief week as the aggressive prophet who cleansed the temple and its courts and who preached his passionate message in the face of official opposition.

8. *THE PROTEST OF THE CHIEF PRIESTS.*

Matthew 21:15–16.

This is Matthew's final incident on Palm Sunday. It, too, has its scene in the temple and it is found only in Matthew. Luke reported a similar situation back in 19:39–40 where the Pharisees protested against the demonstration on the Mount of Olives. Here in the temple, however, the chief priests and scribes protest against the hosannas of the children. Their cry, " Hosanna to the son of David," is verbatim the echo of the shouts of the crowds on the Mount of Olives. (Matt. 21:9.)

In Mark and Luke the demonstration was confined to the Mount of Olives with no echoes of it in the city itself. But in Matthew the ovation that begins at Bethphage (21:1–9) continues down to the gates of the city, through the streets (21:10–11), and finally subsides in the temple (21:15–16). In Matthew it is more sustained and becomes a veritable triumphal procession from the Mount of Olives to the temple itself.

This scene in Matthew marks the first appearance of Jesus' Jerusalem enemies. (Cf. Mark 11:18; Luke 19:47–48.) It is rather surprising at this point that their protest makes no reference to the cleansing of the temple but confines itself to the cries of the children. (Cf. p. 49 f.)

9. *THE RETURN TO BETHANY.*

Matthew 21:17. *Mark* 11:11*c*.

With this brief notice Palm Sunday closes in Matthew and Mark. It is evening; Jesus returns to Bethany, the twelve with him. These retreats to Bethany form the dividing lines between the first three days in Mark, between just the first two days in Matthew. Luke in 21:37 designates " the mount that is called Olivet " as the scene of Jesus' retreats for the Jerusalem nights.

. . . . .

In reviewing this first day, Palm Sunday, we find that it is more eventful in Matthew and Luke than it is in Mark who has reported the demonstration, the visit to the temple, observations, the coming of evening and the return to Bethany. Matthew reported the demonstration on the Mount of Olives, in the streets of the city itself, and then three scenes in the temple — the cleansing, the cures of the blind and the lame, the protest of the chief priests and scribes against the cries of the children — closing with the notice of the return to Bethany. Luke began with three scenes on the Mount of Olives — the demonstration, the protest of the Pharisees against it, the prophecy of the fall of Jerusalem — and ended with the cleansing of the temple. From this point on we have only a vague chronology in Luke (19:47a; 21:37); the sharp dividing lines for Mark's first three days disappear.

CHAPTER II

MONDAY

MONDAY

	Matthew	Mark	Luke		
1 The Cursing of the Fig Tree	21:18–19	11:12–14	....	*Lk 13:6–9; 17:6*	
2 The Cleansing of the Temple[a]	....	15–17	....	*Mt 21:12b–13*	*Lk 19:45b–46*
3 The Chief Priests and the Scribes	....	18	47–48	*Mt 21:15–16*	
4 Jesus Lodges outside the City	....	19	....	*Lk 21:37b*	

[a] John 2:13–17.

THE second day of the passion week is set off very clearly in Mark. In 11:12 we are on the morning of the day following the Bethany demonstration. Jesus and his disciples are on their way into the city from Bethany where they have spent the night. Mark makes no formal notice of the close of this second day (11:19), but in 11:20 we are on the morning following the events related in 11:12–18.

In Matthew 21:18 we have a very specific notice of the beginning of the second day. It is an exact parallel to Mark 11:12 with Jesus returning to Jerusalem after the night spent in Bethany. Matthew, however, does not note the close of the second day nor the beginning of the third. Thus, the events of Monday and Tuesday, so clearly set off in Mark, are merged in the first Gospel. The first notice of a new day in Matthew after 21:18 comes in 26:2 — and this is not wholly clear and distinct — where we are on Wednesday, two days before the Passover. Matthew's merging of events on the second and third days is the result of his bringing the cursing of the fig tree (21:18–19) and Jesus' comment on the withered tree (21:20) immediately together into a continuous narrative and single scene on the morning of the second day. In Mark, however, the cursing of the fig tree (11:12–14) and the comment (11:20–21) are separated by a period of twenty-four hours — the first coming on the morning of the second day and the second coming on the morning of the third day. Of the events that Mark assigns to Monday only the cursing of the fig tree remains in Matthew. The cleansing of the temple Matthew assigned to Palm Sunday (21:12–13) as well as the first encounter of Jesus with his Jerusalem enemies (21:15–16). The general notice of nightly retreats from the city in Mark 11:19 Matthew omits.

Luke has, in reality, no parallels to Mark's second day. He nowhere reports the cursing of the fig tree. Like Matthew, he assigned the cleansing of the temple to Palm Sunday. The general notice of retreats to Olivet each night Luke gives much later (21:37) when Jesus' public work in Jerusalem is done — a sort of retrospect. However, Luke has Jesus' enemies make their first appearance as they do in Matthew and Mark, in connection with the cleansing of the temple (19:47–48), but without definite designation of the day.

In Mark there are two principal events on Monday, the cursing of the fig tree and the cleansing of the temple. These are followed by notices of the desire of the chief priests to destroy Jesus and the habit of leaving the city each evening.

1. *THE CURSING OF THE FIG TREE.*

Matthew 21:18–19. *Mark* 11:12–14.

The second day of the passion week opens with the cursing of the fig tree in both Matthew and Mark. It has its scene on the way into the city after the night in Bethany. Luke omits the cursing of the fig tree altogether. Reasons for this omission are not difficult to supply, although we cannot be sure of just the reason that was at work in Luke's mind. A very plausible reason is to be found in Luke's parable of the barren fig tree in 13:6–9 which may be regarded in substance as a superior parallel to Mark's cursing. A second reason for Luke's omission may be given — namely, he found Mark's cursing offensive, wholly unworthy of Jesus. The very nature of the story was repulsive to him. Such an act he could not fit into his picture of Jesus.

Matthew takes no offense at the cursing of the fig tree. On the contrary, he seems to take a delight in the tale. Matthew goes so far as to have the tree wither on the spot, under the very breath of Jesus' curse and before the very eyes of the disciples. "And immediately the fig tree withered away" (21:19b). In Mark, however, the curse is pronounced on the morning of the second day (11:12–14), and it is only on the following morning that the disciples notice that the tree has withered and call Jesus' attention to the fact (11:20). In Matthew we have an extravagant enhancement of the marvel. In one respect, however, Matthew's account is a definite improvement over Mark, for he omits Mark's notice in 11:13b, "for it was not the season of figs." By this omission Matthew has eliminated the unreasonable and most offensive element in Mark's account.

The cursing of the fig tree has always been a source of embarrassment for Christian writers and readers. The third Evangelist simply removed it from his story of Jesus, and we should have suffered no appreciable loss if the first and second Gospel writers had done the same thing. As the story now stands it has no real religious value. It is impossible to associate it with all that we know of Jesus. It stands in open conflict with practically everything that the Gospel writers have led us to think of him. It is really surprising that the first and second Evangelists do not sense the incompatibility but go ahead to add words of Jesus on prayer and forgiveness in connection with the cursing. (Matt. 21:20–22; Mark 11:20–25.) The mood and temper of the act are wholly foreign to the disposition of the words that follow immediately. Both Matthew and Mark seem to regard the withering of the tree as a striking example of the power of faith in God and prayer to him. Throughout the Gospel story we are deeply impressed, not only with Jesus' words on faith and prayer but with his own actual believing and praying. Yet our impression everywhere has not associated Jesus' faith in God and his confidence in the prayer-act with such questionable acts and incidents. Jesus' believing and praying are extravagant enough, but elsewhere they remain on a high moral level and refuse to resort to magic.

Efforts to save the cursing of the fig tree are as fruitless as the tree. The physical impossibility of the act takes it out of the realm of historical probability. No moral motive can be discovered that might justify the act, if it were physically possible. The reported hunger of Jesus is only a feeble confession of its groundlessness in reason. How sharp is the conflict between Jesus' reactions to hunger here and in the first temptation of Matthew (4:1–4) and Luke (4:1–4)! The unreasonableness of cursing a tree for not bearing fruit out of season [1] requires an utterly faithless credulity to save it. It is the only destructive act attributed to Jesus with the exception of the later legend of the herd of swine catapulting down the steep into the Sea of Galilee.[2] From both the historical and the religious angles the sense and courage of Luke in discarding it will recommend themselves to us.

2. *THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE.*
Mark 11:15–17.

The cleansing of the temple we met in the arrangement of Matthew and Luke as a part of Palm Sunday. In both this striking step was taken on the first day on the first visit. In the first and third Gospels, then, the act appears more temperamental in character, more impulsive, performed on the spur of the moment. In Mark, on the other hand, the cleansing is the principal incident in the city itself on the second day. Since Jesus' first visit to the temple and his observations on the first day a night in Bethany has intervened. In Mark Jesus does not act at once on the first visit but only on entering the temple on Monday, the second day. The act in Mark, too, has its own special character: it is delayed, deliberate and determined. Mark seems to intend to convey the impression that Jesus, after his observations on Palm Sunday, comes to the decision to cleanse the temple during the night in Bethany, for he acts promptly on arriving at the temple the next morning.

---

[1] We are here in April and the ripened figs come only in June.

[2] Matt. 8:30–32; Mark 5:11–13; Luke 8:32–33.

Luke recounts the cleansing in the fewest possible words. He mentions only the casting out of them that sold with no reference to the buyers, the overthrowing of the tables of the money-changers and the seats of them that sold doves. Luke's interest seems to center chiefly in Jesus' words on this occasion, for he reproduces the full Markan form with the exception of the phrase, "for all the nations." But his radical condensation would show that he does not ascribe to it the importance for what follows that Matthew and Mark do. Luke pictures the Jerusalem opposition as centering around Jesus' teaching rather than any particular act of his. This is clear in his special version of the charges against Jesus at the Roman trial. (23:2–5.)

Both Matthew and Luke omit the most distinctive feature of Mark's account, verse 16: " and he would not suffer that any man should carry a vessel through the temple." In Mark, then, this act appears all the more determined and revolutionary, for he not only cleanses the temple but polices it. Josephus tells us that it was forbidden to bring a vessel into the temple. It is now generally supposed that the traffic which Jesus here blocks is the use of the temple courts as a short-cut from one quarter of the city to another.

Some of the most familiar details of the cleansing of the temple are found only in the Fourth Gospel (2:13–17): the oxen, the sheep, the whip of cords. In John we should think that Jesus drove them all out, man and beast, except the dove-sellers whom he commands, " Take these things hence." He seems less drastic with this group; his only word is addressed to them, not to all the traders: " Make not my Father's house a house of merchandise." (2:16.) This word makes no reference to the temple as a house of prayer, as in the first three Gospels, and Jesus speaks of it as " my Father's house " as he does in Luke 2:49. In the Fourth Gospel the Old Testament passage is not on the lips of Jesus but is called to the disciples' minds by the scene as a whole, " Zeal for thy house shall eat me up." (Ps. 69:9.)

c to W

The actual conditions that prevailed in the courts of the temple and that brought Jesus into action are not exactly known to us. The Jewish regulations and precepts were specific and strict enough on the purity of the temple.

But enforcement, as always, may have been a different matter. Rabbi Klausner admits a probable breach between precept and practice. " In Jesus' time the Sadducee-Boethuseans controlled the temple, and they may not have treated the outer court as too holy to permit of the sale of doves and pigeons or of money-changing for the purchase of seals for the various temple offerings." [3]

The cleansing of the temple must have been a remarkable scene. A stranger from the north country drives out the trade and traffic. Whether accomplished with the aid of his disciples and others or alone and single-handed, it still remains a striking step for any newcomer in Jerusalem. To just what the act owed its success, we cannot say: the speed and surprise with which Jesus took the situation in his own hands, the guilty conscience of the dealers and the authorities who permitted this trade, the approval and support of general public sentiment, or simply the imposing impression of Jesus' personality. How long the remedied condition continued we do not know. At least, the temple is the chief center of Jesus' public teaching during these two or three days, and there is no account of a repetition of the act. There is no reason for supposing that he accomplished anything permanent. With his speedy disappearance from the scene, things probably went on as before.

The cleansing of the temple is a genuinely prophetic act. All the way through the account of Jesus in the first three Gospels, in his general teaching and religious experience, we come to think of him as a prophetic personality. Now that he swings into action in the temple, he is still the prophet, still the champion of a moral and ethical religion over against a religion of cult and ceremony. The cleansing of the temple is simply another scene in the age-old conflict between the priest and the prophet; two fundamentally opposed experiences of religion here come to grips. It was at Israel's altars and shrines that the prophets had appeared announcing their message of doom, condemning the elaborate systems of cult that were empty of genuine worship and calling for a turning from these things to the will and way of God. The prophetic character of the act here is especially clear in Jesus' word which is a combination of two passages from the prophets. (Isa. 58:7b; Jer. 7:11.) In his opposition to the temple's trade and traffic Jesus is true to the very best of the prophetic spirit.

---

[3] Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth,* p. 314.

The cleansing of the temple required some pilgrim prophet from the provinces. It would be difficult to conceive of the idea occurring to a native of Jerusalem, still more difficult to imagine him setting the idea into action. The Jerusalemite was not shocked by the trade and the traffic; he was accustomed to the business side of religion. In cleansing the temple Jesus appears as the unspoiled Galilean who has not learned to think of the holy place in terms of its trade and traffic and who still idealizes it as a place of prayer and worship. The man who prayed to

God in the solitude and seclusion of the Galilean deserts, who had learned to know silence for the sacrament that it is, could not adjust his spiritual ideals and instincts to the din and discord in the outer courts of God's sanctuary.

In the Fourth Gospel the cleansing of the temple is out of all association with the passion week. Instead of standing as the last great public act of Jesus, as it is in the first three Gospels, it comes at the very beginning of his work and is really his first step into public. (2:13–17.) It comes at the time of a Passover, but it precedes by two (or three) years the Passover at which Jesus dies.[4] The cleansing of the temple in the Fourth Gospel is too far removed from the time of Jesus' death to have been in any sense a contributing cause. In fact, it is not followed by any unpleasant consequences. It has no bearing on the fate of Jesus and we must seek a different cause for his death in the Fourth Gospel. This we find in the raising of Lazarus which is presented as the one act of Jesus out of which the final death plot grows. (11:47–53.)

In the first three Gospels the cleansing of the temple belongs to the death days. It is removed from the cross by only four days in Mark, five days in Matthew and Luke. It is the chief promoting factor that brings about Jesus' death. With this scene the passion drama proper begins. If we ask the plain historical question, What one thing brought about Jesus' death in such an abrupt and tragic manner?

---

[4] Our present text of the Fourth Gospel reports three Passovers during Jesus' public career: 2:13; 6:4; 11:55. In some manuscripts there is the possibility of a fourth Passover (and a third year) in 5:1 with the reading, "*the* feast."

we shall have to answer, The cleansing of the temple. To be sure, the cleansing does not figure in the charges against Jesus in the trial scenes, but henceforth the chief priests and their agents are omnipresent. They figure either directly or indirectly in every instigation against him and they never leave off their persistent pursuit until the death scene itself. They could not use the cleansing of the temple as a case against Jesus, for the act doubtless had popular approval. But it does explain the determined and bitter opposition of the chief priests to the man who defied their system, invaded their own special precinct of authority and took things into his own hands.

In the concrete situation in Jerusalem the cleansing of the temple was about the most radical step that Jesus could have taken. This we appreciate in what follows — the prompt appearance of the temple authorities, their bitter antagonism against Jesus and the tragic, abrupt end. The cleansing of the temple was the one act of Jesus that set the death machinery going that crushed him within less than a week. If Jesus had not cleansed the temple, he might have worked in Jerusalem for weeks and months, even years. But as we learn to know Jesus in the Gospel story we cannot imagine him failing to cleanse the temple.

3. *THE CHIEF PRIESTS AND THE SCRIBES.*
Mark 11:18. *Luke* 19:47–48.

This is the first appearance of Jesus' Jerusalem enemies in Mark and Luke. In Matthew they appeared on the preceding day (21:15–16) in connection with the cleansing and cures in the temple. (21:12–14.) Matthew presented an actual encounter with the chief priests and scribes, to our surprise, protesting against the hosannas of the children rather than the cleansing itself. Matthew noted no plot against Jesus' life. Mark and Luke here give no actual encounter between Jesus and his Jerusalem enemies but both apprise their readers of the plot against his life. Mark has the chief priests and scribes as witnesses of Jesus' words and deeds, and he presents their plot as growing directly out of what they have seen and heard at the cleansing. In all three Gospels the Jerusalem opposition appears at a natural point, in connection with the cleansing of the temple; the chief priests and scribes are bent on Jesus' death.

Both Matthew and Mark have Jesus' popularity protecting him. This popular favor they associate with his teaching and the eagerness with which the people listen rather than with the radical step he has just taken. This, however, must have met with general public approval for there is no waning in the eagerness with which the people listen to his words. This open defiance of the constituted authorities probably increased the public interest in Jesus and enhanced the general impression which he left with the people.

Jesus had met with opposition in Galilee. His principal opponents were the Pharisees. Their opposition grew out of what Jesus represented and stood for, what he neglected and permitted, but it was not deeply personal or dangerous. In Jerusalem, however, Jesus strikes a very different set of enemies and they oppose him for very different reasons. They are more powerful, the chief priests, the most powerful Jewish party in Palestine. We realize how powerful they were when we note that they bring about Jesus' death within less than a week. Their opposition to Jesus is bitterly personal. They are determined upon his end because of what he personally has done. He has taken authority into his own hands; he must die. For the Jerusalem authorities Jesus was perhaps nothing more than just an unsophisticated prophetic upstart from the north country who deserved the prompt end that overtook him.

4. *JESUS LODGES OUTSIDE THE CITY.*
Mark 11:19.

This is the closing notice of the second day of the passion week in Mark. That it is the close is fully clear only in the next passage which brings us to the morning of the third day. (Mark 11:20.) Mark 11:19 does not apply to this second day in particular but to the Jerusalem days as a whole. It is really only a generalization of the notice with which Matthew (21:17) and Mark (11:11) brought Palm Sunday to a close. Matthew has no such general notice in this or any other connection, but Luke has the same notice at the end of the public days in 21:37b. Mark does not mention Bethany here as in 11:11; he seems to assume that his readers know. Luke designates the Mount of Olives as the scene of Jesus' nightly retreats, and Bethany does not have the prominence and importance in Luke that it has in the accounts of Matthew and Mark. With Bethany Luke associates just one incident — the demonstration. Thus, the Mount of Olives supplants Bethany in the third Gospel.

. . . . .

The second day of the passion week, Monday, closes with the death drama well under way. Jesus has invaded the stronghold of the highest and most powerful authorities. Prophet-like, he has followed his religious instincts and impulses; he has driven the trade and traffic from the outer courts of the temple. By this act he has dramatized his prophetic message. He is a man of deed and action as well as of speech. "The people all hung upon him, listening." (Luke 19:48b.) Public sentiment is with him in all that he says and does, but popular favor cannot always save a man from an abrupt and catastrophic fate. It may protect him for a time, but constituted authority has its own efficient ways of working. His death becomes, then, merely a matter of time, a very short time. Any delay is the result perhaps of public feeling which must be satisfied by some plausible case against him. But in no case is the delay long, and public favor does not deter his enemies from speedy action once they are ready to strike.

CHAPTER III

TUESDAY

TUESDAY

		Matthew	Mark	Luke		
1	The Withered Fig Tree	21:20	11:20–21	....		
2	Faith in God and Prayer	21–22	22–25	....	*Mt 17:20*	*Lk 17:6*
3	The Question of Jesus' Authority (a)	23–27	27–33	20:1–8		
4	The Parable of the Two Unlike Sons	28–32	....	....	*Lk 7:29–30*	
5	The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen	33–46	12:1–12	9–19		
6	The Parable of the Marriage Feast	22:1–14	....	....	*Lk 14:16–24*	
7	The Question of the Tribute Money (b)	15–22	13–17	20–26		
8	The Question of the Resurrection (c)	23–33	18–27	27–38		
9	The Question of the Great Command (d)	34–40	28–34	39–40	*Lk 10:25–28*	
10	The Question of David's Messiah (e)	41–46	35–37	41–44		
11	ADDRESS AGAINST SCRIBES AND PHARISEES	23:1–39	38–40	45–47	*Lk 11:37–54*	
12	The Widow's Mites	....	41–44	21:1–4		
13	Prophecy of Destruction of the Temple [a]	24:1–2	13:1–2	5–6		
14	ADDRESS ON THE LAST THINGS	24:3–25:46	3–37	7–36	*Lk 17:20–37*	
15	Jesus Lodges outside the City	....	....	37–38	*Mk 11:19*	

---

[a] John 2:19–22.
Matt. 26:61; 27:40.
Mark 14:58; 15:29–30.

THE third day of the passion week is the most eventful of all; in fact, it is the most eventful single day in the public life of Jesus in the first three Gospels. To no other day do the first three Evangelists assign so much matter; to no other do they devote so much space. So much takes place on Tuesday that the reader easily forgets that he is following Jesus day by day through this last week. Some think that the day is overloaded and are skeptical about Mark's division into days at this point as well as at others. That everything belonged just here as Mark reports it, we cannot, of course, be certain. It may be that the very nature of the matter — debates and discourses — assigned to the day tended to group it at this one point when in reality some of it belonged to other days, even to Galilee. The debates and discourses assigned to Tuesday could easily have fallen within such a narrow time limit, but it remains surprising that so much happens on this day, so little in comparison on the first and second or on the fourth and fifth days.

A glance at the outline of events (opposite page) will show how full the day is and the amount of space that the first three Gospels devote to it. The day begins in Mark 11:20 and extends through 13:37 — two and one-half chapters over against a half chapter for the first two days.

In 14:1 we are on the fourth day. Matthew gives his parallels still more space than Mark, four and one-half chapters (21:21–25:46), due to the fact that he introduces, especially in the discourses, a great deal of matter not found in Mark's Gospel. We must remember that Matthew notes neither the day's beginning nor its close and that he has merged Mark's second and third days by having no interval of twenty-four hours between the cursing of the fig tree (21:18–19) and Jesus' comment on the withered tree (21:20) such as Mark has (11:12–14, 20–21). If it were not for Mark's twenty-four hours between the curse (11:12–14) and the comment (11:20–21) we should naturally think that all the matter in Matthew 21:21–25:46 belonged on the same day, Monday, as the cursing of the fig tree (21:18–20). In Matthew 26:1 we are two days before the Passover.

We have become accustomed to Luke's vague chronology for the first three days of the passion week. He did not note the close of the first, the beginning or the close of the second day. He shows no interest in a day-by-day division. In all of his parallels to Mark's first three days Luke has a single chronological notice in 20:1 — "on one of the days." This notice is parallel to the beginning of the temple scenes on Mark's third day. What is very clearly the fourth day in Mark (14:1), two days before the Passover, becomes in Luke (22:1) just a note concerning the nearness of the Passover. Luke's chronology fails to appear doubtless because of his lack of interest, but actually it disappears because he omits the cursing of the fig tree and Jesus' subsequent comment with which Mark's notices of the beginning of the second and third days, respectively, are associated. (Mark 11:12, 20.) In space Luke's parallels (20:1–21:38) correspond very closely to Mark, for he makes no extensive elaboration of the two discourses as Matthew does in this section. After omitting the first two passages, Luke parallels Mark almost passage for passage throughout the day.

It is worth while to follow the shifts of scene on this third day in Mark. Tuesday, like Monday, opens with a scene on the way into the city — the discovery of the withered fig tree and Jesus' comments. (Mark 11:20–25.) Then follows the scene in the temple where most of the matter reported has its setting. (11:27–12:44.) Jesus leaves the temple in 13:1–2 — apparently toward evening. Finally, the day comes to a close with the address on the last things on the Mount of Olives. (13:3–37.) The shifts of scene are exactly the same in Matthew, keeping in mind that the second and third days are merged.[1] In Luke these shifts of scene disappear. He has no scene on the way into the city. For all that is reported in this section Luke has just one scene, the temple. (20:1–23:38.) He has no notice of Jesus leaving the temple (21:5–6) and he does not associate the address on the last things with the Mount of Olives (21:7).

---

[1] On the way into the city (Matt. 21:18–22); in the temple (21:23–23:39); leaving the temple (24:1–2); on the Mount of Olives (24:3–25:46).

The third day differs in a very distinctive manner from the first two in the character of its events. Palm Sunday and Monday were days of action — the Bethany demonstration and the cleansing of the temple. Although we were assured that "all the multitude was astonished at his teaching" (Mark 11:18b) and that "the people all hung upon him, listening" (Luke 19:48b), nevertheless Jesus' actual teachings hardly appeared. We had only isolated utterances growing out of some particular situation like his reply to the protest of the Pharisees (Luke 19:49) and the chief priests (Matt. 21:16), his forecast of the fall of Jerusalem (Luke 19:41–44), or his word in connection with the cleansing of the temple (Mark 11:17). But on the third day action of a dramatic nature stops and the Jerusalem drama goes ahead by what is said rather than by what is done.

Tuesday is characterized by debates, dialectic and discourse. It is only on Tuesday, the last day in public, that Jesus' Jerusalem message appears and that we are able to compare its general tone, character and substance with the Galilean message. Any change we find is in tone rather than in substance, for most of Jesus' utterances on this last day come from scenes of bitter conflict with his Jerusalem opponents. In general, Jesus' words in Jerusalem are more argumentative than his usual Galilean teachings, but this is the result of the changed and critical situation in which he finds himself rather than of any actual alteration in his thinking.

It is strange that nearly all of Jesus' utterances that may be classed as public message in the Holy City fall on this particular day of the passion week. It suggests some literary device and increases the skepticism of those who find Mark's division into days mechanical and artificial. Nevertheless, we find similar concentration points for conflicts and teachings in the Galilean story. (Matt. 5–7; Mark 2:1–3:6.). This piling-up of debate and discourse on Tuesday of the passion week is not a new feature in the Gospel story. What the Gospel writers, for the most part, assign to a special day came from different days and was intended to illustrate the nature of the debates and discourses on other or all of the days. At any rate, it is Mark's Tuesday of the passion week that gives us the main body of Jesus' public message in the Holy City. Some of the matter seems by its very nature to belong to it; other parts have no organic connection with just this stage in the development of the Jerusalem drama.

We turn now to the materials themselves for we have seen enough already to realize that they are not only very extensive but very important. For all of their extent and importance the Fourth Gospel has not a single parallel to any of the matter which the first three Gospels associate with this day.

1. *THE WITHERED FIG TREE.*

Matthew 21:20 *Mark* 11:20–21.

This scene is virtually a repetition of the opening scene of the preceding day in Mark. It is morning; Jesus is on his way into the city; the withered fig tree is the center of interest. In Mark, then, twenty-four hours elapse between the cursing (11:12) and the discovery of the withered tree (11:20). Matthew, however, has joined the two separated parts of the story by having the tree wither on the spot, and the cursing and the comment form a single scene on the morning of the second day. (21:18–20.)

2. *FAITH IN GOD AND PRAYER.*

Matthew 21:21–22. *Mark* 11:22–25.

Luke, having omitted the cursing of the fig tree, naturally omits Jesus' comments which Matthew and Mark associate with the withered tree. Jesus' utterances here deal with the familiar themes of faith in God and prayer. However, they have no natural connection with the cursing of the fig tree in which Jesus did not pray and exhibited no special faith in God. Further, the mood and temper of these words are in utter discord with the nature of the preceding act. They are in no sense a natural outgrowth of the curse. Rather they are in open conflict with it, and we cannot conceive of such words and such a curse crossing the lips of one and the same man. The association here is the work of Matthew and Mark who seem to add these exalted words on faith and prayer to explain the marvel on the fig tree.

In this little group of utterances on faith and prayer we have another example of settingless sayings. They do not grow naturally out of their present associations. When and where Jesus spoke them we have no way of finding out. Some of them occur in wholly different settings. (Matt. 17:20; Luke 17:16; Matt. 6:14, 23b.) Both their theme and their treatment suggest Galilee rather than the tense, tragic days in the Holy City. The picture of the mountain by the sea is Galilean rather than Judean.

. . . . .

It is only at this point that the distinctive features of Tuesday begin to appear — the series of five contentions of Jesus with his Jerusalem opponents. These five follow in rapid succession in all of the first three Gospels. All five are presented in the form of questions, the first four put to Jesus by his opponents; in the case of the fifth the tables are turned and Jesus puts a question to them. Matthew elaborates this series with two parables not found in Mark's Gospel — the parable of the unlike sons and the parable of the marriage feast. Luke makes no important elaborations, but he leaves only a ragged remnant of the question on the great command which he used in a very different and much earlier connection. Through the contentions and addresses on this third day Luke follows the arrangement and account of Mark more closely than at any other point in the whole of the passion week.

As we have already noted, it is surprising that all of the Jerusalem conflicts fall on this one day. It would be more natural for them to appear on different days whereever Jesus is confronted by his Jerusalem enemies. This grouping into a single series is neither a logical nor a chronological one. Only the first two contentions are of a critical character with a potential bearing on the fatal issue. The last three scenes are not critical, for little more than permissible difference of opinion is involved. Any careful reader of Mark would be skeptical of the series as a chronological arrangement. There are no evident ties within the series to form an actual temporal succession; there are no vital bonds of cause and effect to hold them together.

Mark's grouping of conflicts at this point is exactly like his treatment of the Galilean conflicts. With one exception (7:1–23), he brought all of the Galilean contentions into a single series in 2:1–3:6 — a concentration of conflict scenes from all stages, early and late, of Jesus' Galilean work. With the series Mark gave a clear illustration of the nature of the issue that existed between Jesus and his Galilean opponents. The same consideration will explain the concentration of the Jerusalem conflicts at this one point. As incidents of like character they would naturally tend to form a group, and with this group the nature of the issue between Jesus and his Jerusalem enemies would be made clear once for all. The only bond that holds the group together is topical — all are scenes of conflict in the Holy City.

We are not certain that even this elaborate series is complete. There is another conflict scene that may belong to the group — the story of the adulteress in John 7:53–8:11. It is not found in the first three Gospels except in a few manuscripts of Luke in which it is inserted after 21:38. The incident by virtue of its loose location in the Fourth Gospel, its general character, the issue presented, the attitude of Jesus and his telling reply belongs to the story in the first three Gospels. The retreat to the Mount of Olives (8:1), the return to the temple in the morning, the whole situation would take it out of the Fourth Gospel and bring it into the Synoptic passion story. Some are inclined to insert it between the second and third contentions, between Mark 12:17 and 12:18.

The Jerusalem conflicts are of a very different character from the Galilean contentions. (Mark 2:1–3:6; 7:1–23.) They are much more serious and critical. In the first two conflicts, the principal ones of the series, Jesus' enemies are seeking a case against him. Jesus' life is in danger. An ill-advised statement may be used as cause sufficient for prompt prosecution. In Galilee the situation was not so serious. Jesus was opposed because of the unorthodoxy of his teaching and the unconventionality of his conduct. The Galilean case against Jesus could never in Jewish justice have resulted in his death. In Mark

2:1–3:5 Jesus has said or done nothing to warrant the plot against his life in 3:6—a premature anticipation of the Jerusalem conspiracy. On the basis of the Galilean conflicts about the only case that could be made against Jesus was that he was a non-conformist.

The issues are different in Galilee and Jerusalem. In Galilee we met questions of the Jewish law and tradition, Jesus' conduct on the Sabbath, his association with publicans and sinners, the matter of fasting and of the ceremonial washing of hands. In Jerusalem these issues do not appear and all the conflicts seem to center upon one act of Jesus — the cleansing of the temple. The act itself is not debated, unless it is in the first conflict, but it is the source of the bitter hatred that meets Jesus in all that follows. The Galilean opposition was of a general nature, having to do with Jesus' teaching and practice of religion. The Jerusalem opposition, however, is intensely personal; his enemies are bent on his destruction.

In Galilee Jesus' replies in conflict were statements of general principles, covering whole issues, yet they were decisive, settling the issue once for all. The Jerusalem contentions have to do less with general principles and center more on particular positions. The issues are more technical; there is more argumentation, more hair-splitting. Their successful issue depends more on the careful making of a point. Jesus' replies are consequently more guarded, more evasive, often a refusal to commit himself. In critical cases Jesus throws his enemies into a dilemma. On both sides there is more parrying for position, more caution against the exposure of a vulnerable point.

In the Galilean contentions we are impressed with the liberality and wholesomeness of Jesus' conception and practice of religion.[2] In the Jerusalem contentions we are struck by Jesus' intellectual resourcefulness, with his ability to meet his enemies on their own ground, with their own weapons and to defeat them in public encounter.[3]

Matthew and Luke follow the text of Mark very closely through these contentions. This is necessary, of course, because of the argumentative character of the materials. The whole point to these scenes depends in each case on a careful preservation of exactly what is said. All of the first three Gospel writers seem to look upon these scenes as duels of wits.

3. *THE QUESTION OF JESUS' AUTHORITY* (*a*).
Matthew 21:23–27. *Mark* 11:27–33. *Luke* 20:1–8.

The scene of events for Tuesday now shifts to the temple which remains the principal scene for the day. Luke omitted the scenes on the way into the city on both the second and third days, the scenes associated with the fig tree. All of Luke's parallels to Mark's Tuesday have their scene here in the temple and there is no shift to the Mount of Olives as there is at the close of the day in Matthew and Mark. We meet here, too, Luke's only notice of time in his materials parallel to Mark's first three days, "on one of the days." This is, of course, very indefinite and makes it clear to us how Luke's calendar for the last week fades out. However, it is evident that Luke thinks of Jesus' work in Jerusalem as very brief; he speaks of it in terms of days rather than of weeks. On the other hand, this indefinite notice seems to suggest a wider compass than the three brief public days in Mark.

---

[2] Cf. Mark 2:17, 27; 3:4a.

[3] Cf. Mark 11:30; 12:17a.

This first contention has to do with Jesus' authority. "By what authority doest thou these things? or who gave thee this authority to do these things?" (Mark 11:28). The authority for what things is not perfectly clear. The very framing of the question suggests some act by which Jesus has taken things into his own hands. The presence of the chief priests, the plot against Jesus' life that they have made, would center the conflict on Jesus' authority for cleansing the temple.

Jesus replies with an ingenious counter-question. "The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from men?" (Mark 11:30.) But the query arises, Is Jesus' reply really an answer, or is he simply evasive and shrewd enough not to commit himself and yet throw his opponents into a dilemma? Some regard Jesus' counter-question as an answer. The Gospel writers, however, do not seem to be thinking of this possibility. Rather they picture in a graphic manner the embarrassment and confusion of Jesus' adversaries. He has thrown them into a dilemma; they are not slow to see the point. To answer at all, they would commit themselves to condemnation. Consequently, they refuse to answer. That this reply of Jesus' is not really an answer but a dilemma seems clearer still in the following contention in which his opponents come armed with a similar dilemma. (Mark 12:14b–15a.) Further, there is the evident delight of the Gospel writers in Jesus' superiority in dialectic and repartee.

The scene ends in a deadlock. Neither side has committed itself. The authorities have not been able to advance their case against Jesus. However, the tragedy has moved on a pace; the breach between Jesus and his enemies has widened. Subsequent events show the deadliness of their determination. They withdraw from this one encounter, but they have not lost the battle. They have the power to carry out their plot. They are simply awaiting the proper moment, seeking if possible a plausible case against him. They can wait; a little delay is not a great matter.

The first contention scene is not over, for Jesus turns to attack his opponents in parable. Mark and Luke associate only one parable with this contention, the parable of the wicked husbandmen, to which they give a clear polemical point. (Mark 12:12; Luke 20:19.) Matthew, however, arranges a series of three parables as a part of this first conflict — the parable of the unlike sons, the wicked husbandmen and the marriage feast — a veritable volley.

To all three Matthew gives a polemical point, still more uncovered and direct than in Mark and Luke.[4]

4. *THE PARABLE OF THE TWO UNLIKE SONS.*

Matthew 21:28–32.

This first parable in Matthew's series is found only in his Gospel. In it two familiar themes of Jesus' teaching appear — the doing of the divine will and the contrast between saying and doing. It recalls another word of Jesus' found only in Matthew (23:3) directed against the scribes and Pharisees who " say, and do not." The parable has no necessary connection with the Jerusalem conflicts. Originally it was doubtless an isolated parable which Matthew commands at just this juncture because it lends itself to the making of a point against the Jerusalem adversaries.

5. *THE PARABLE OF THE WICKED HUSBANDMEN.*

Matthew 21:33–46. *Mark* 12:1–12. *Luke* 20:9–19.

This is the only parable which Mark and Luke associate with this first contention. It is the second in Matthew's series of three. There are only minor differences in details and development.

This story of the wicked husbandmen is no longer pure parable with the point made through its principal thought. It is rather allegory with special meanings read even into the details. It does not picture a natural and normal human situation, but presents a Christian interpretation of the religious history of Israel climaxing in the crucifixion of Jesus. They have rejected the chief stone of the corner and now they are rejected.

---

[4] Cf. Matt. 21:31b–32, 43, 45; 22:7, 11–14.

The whole was written originally and read in the light of Jesus' death and the Easter faith. If there was some original utterance of Jesus out of which this passage grew, we have no way of determining exactly what it was. It does not fit itself naturally into any polemic uttered by Jesus during the brief and critical Jerusalem days.

The passage ends with a fresh determination of Jesus' enemies to take him, but public favor protects him. In all probability the Jerusalem authorities did not dare take Jesus openly. It may be that they would have been unable to do so. When they do take him, it is with great secrecy and quick action.

With this parable the first contention scene ends in Mark and Luke. Jesus' enemies depart. Matthew, however, has a third parable to add to this first conflict. Consequently, he notes no shift of scene or audience at the close of this passage.

6. *THE PARABLE OF THE MARRIAGE FEAST.*
Matthew 22:1–14.

Luke has substantially this same parable of Jesus (14:16–24), but it is far removed from any association with the passion week. He includes it near the middle of the long section of his Gospel which he devotes to the journey to Jerusalem. (9:51–19:28.) It is the last of a series of three table talks which Luke arranges in 14:1–24.

The two forms of this parable in Matthew and Luke are so different that they have really only general features and framework in common. They differ greatly in development, details and treatment. Matthew's parable is in no sense a unity. The conclusion about the man with the wedding garment (11–14) is a later appendix not found in Luke's form. The two parts (1–10 and 11–14) were originally perhaps separate and distinct parables that began very much alike. If we use verse 2 a second time and read it just ahead of 11–14, we get a second complete parable. Luke's form of the parable is nearer some probable utterance of Jesus. Matthew's form is completely Christianized and is in no sense an organic part of the Jerusalem events.

7. THE QUESTION OF THE TRIBUTE MONEY (b).

Matthew 22:15–22. *Mark* 12:13–17. *Luke* 20:20–26.

This is the second of the Jerusalem conflicts and there seems to be some logical connection between it and the first. The whole situation here seems to presuppose previous futile attempts to ensnare Jesus. In fact, the dilemma with which they approach Jesus recalls at once the fact that he has just defeated his enemies with a similar dilemma. They turn his own weapon upon him. This would seem to indicate that these first two conflicts, at least, belong together. However, this natural bond has been broken in Mark and Luke by the insertion of the parable of the wicked husbandmen. In Matthew the breach is still wider with three parables intervening.

The chief priests do not appear in this scene, but the Pharisees and the Herodians appear as their agents. Luke mentions neither party but speaks of their agents as "spies." The plan of the opponents is to catch Jesus in his talk. Luke adds that they intend to denounce him before the Roman governor. Their opening parry is a psychological ruse intended to throw Jesus off his guard and to induce him to give a direct answer. "Teacher, we know that thou art true, and carest not for any one; for thou regardest not the person of men, but of a truth teachest the way of God." (Mark 12:20.) Independent of how it was meant, the statement presents a really discriminating characterization of certain phases of Jesus' personality.

Without a halt they launch their dilemma, so framed as to force Jesus to commit himself one way or the other: "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not?" It remains a single theoretical question in Matthew and Luke, but Mark adds a second question which makes it a practical, patriotic issue: "Shall we give, or shall we not give?" An affirmative answer will threaten his present public favor; a negative answer will expose him to the Romans. The dilemma is very cleverly put. Then follows a dramatic piece of dialectic.

" Bring me a denarius."

They brought it.

" Whose is this image and superscription? "

" Caesar's."

" Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

In the first contention the opponents refused to answer Jesus' dilemma, and the Gospel writers delight in the fact that Jesus answers their dilemma, however, eluding their ingenious pitfall.

Jesus' reply has become a famous axiom. Some find here a complete separation of religion and politics; others find just the opposite. But it is the cautious, non-committal character of the statement that is its real point and that admits of such a double interpretation. Jesus is not saying whether the affairs of religion and those of the state conflict or coincide. He is simply evading a dangerous dilemma. It is a reply that gives no real answer. We may not legitimately extend its meaning beyond the critical situation in which it was spoken. This subtle statement belongs to the Jerusalem conflicts, not to the fields of political and ecclesiastical theory. From it we may not extract social programs and policies. Jesus' attitude on the relation of church and state may not be determined in the light of a single special statement but in the light of the total temper of his mind according to which no human interest is exempt from a solemn religious obligation of man to his Maker.

The second of the Jerusalem conflicts ends as did the first — at the expense of Jesus' opponents. He is more than their match in quickness of wits. His statements have a subtle polemical point. He does not commit himself. His enemies make no progress in securing what might be used as a popular or legal case against him. But the fatal breach that began with the cleansing of the temple is widened. Each encounter augments the determination of the Jerusalem opposition.

. . . . .

As we noted earlier, these first two conflicts are the most critical of the series of five. They involve issues in which an ill-advised statement could be used publicly or legally against Jesus. In the last three conflicts, now following in rapid succession, no such critical issues are involved. They could not furnish any real case against Jesus in Jewish or Roman court. They have more of the character of theological controversies in which differences of opinion could have no serious consequences.

8. *THE QUESTION OF THE RESURRECTION* (*c*).

Matthew 22:23–33. *Mark* 12:18–27. *Luke* 20:27–38.

This third contention introduces a new party into the Jerusalem conflicts, the Sadducees. In this series of five the first three Gospel writers seem interested in providing the most varied and colorful array of parties over against

Jesus — the chief priests, Pharisees, Herodians, Sadducees, scribes and lawyers. The Sadducees are introduced as though their distinctive feature were their denial of the resurrection. They were not, however, a philosophical-theological, but an ecclesiastical-political party. They had surrendered the messianic hope; consequently, they favored the adoption of Hellenistic culture and cooperation with Roman rule.

They approach Jesus with a proposition that is calculated to render the belief in the resurrection absurd and ridiculous — a childless woman who, according to ancient law, becomes the wife of seven brothers as they die off one after the other. In Mark and Luke it is a purely hypothetical proposition, a sort of stock-in-trade argument against the belief in the resurrection. In Matthew, however, they speak as though they had a special concrete case in mind, " Now there were with us seven brethren."

The reply of Jesus has nothing characteristic, certainly nothing distinctive about it. The whole scene is unimpressive and unconvincing. It has no natural or necessary place here in the Jerusalem conflicts. It exhibits no special enmity or bitterness of feeling and cannot have had any causal bearing on the fatal outcome. The same is true of the two encounters that follow.

9. *THE QUESTION CONCERNING THE GREAT COMMAND* (*d*).

Matthew 22:34–40. *Mark* 12:28–34. *Luke* 20:39–40.

This is the fourth of the Jerusalem contentions in Matthew and Mark. Luke, however, has taken it from this late place in the Gospel story and has used it as a setting for his parable of the good Samaritan. (10:25–28, 36–37.) The key utterance of the passage, the one great commandment, Luke puts on the lips of the lawyer while in Matthew and Mark it is a word of Jesus. Matthew greatly abbreviates the Markan form by omitting the second half of the passage.

In Mark the scribe's question is honest and open with no insidious intent, and Jesus gives a frank answer that seems to satisfy him. Matthew, however, places him in the array of Jerusalem antagonists; he is a lawyer representing the assembled Pharisees. Luke's lawyer is also trying Jesus, but he puts a very different question, "Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" (10:25.) This was the question of the rich young ruler in another connection.[5] But the question in Matthew and Mark, "What commandment is the first of all?" does not suggest an insidious intent. Any Jewish teacher might give his opinion without evasion and without involving himself. With a total of 365 prohibitions and 248 commandments it was a rather pertinent question.

Jesus' reply is genuinely prophetic. He begins with

[5] Matt. 19:16; Mark 10:17; Luke 18:18.

Israel's great confession of faith, the *Shema* (Deut. 6:4–5) and he ends with the heart of the book of Leviticus (19:18). From the great mass of legal matter in his people's religion he singles out the two great sentences, its basal precepts on religion as reverence and righteousness. The first is not a theoretical and formal confession to Israel's monotheism but a practical personal conviction of each loyal Jew. The second is Israel's great social sentence, and in the history of Christianity it has almost obscured the first.[6] There is a Galilean echo in Jesus' word here. It recalls certain of the passages of the Sermon on the Mount.

Such attempts to summarize the essential substance of the law and the prophets were not new. The Jewish Rabbis generally were interested in just such. But it is interesting to note the sureness with which Jesus here singles out the very heart of his people's piety. Whether he was the first to strike upon this summary we cannot say. The important item is that we find it in his thinking at all. Such a passage makes a substantial contribution to our knowledge of Jesus but it does not aid materially our understanding of the Jerusalem tragedy that is soon to come.

[6] Cf. Rom. 13:8 ff; Gal. 5:14; Jas. 2:8; Did. 1:2.

10. *THE QUESTION OF DAVID'S MESSIAH* (*e*).

Matthew 22:41–46. *Mark* 12:35–37. *Luke* 20:41–44.

In each of the first four contentions Jesus was approached with a question. At the close of the preceding scene Mark and Luke told us of their abandonment of this method against him. It yields no usable material and proceeds at their expense. "And no man after that durst ask him any question." (Mark 12:34; cf. Matt. 22:46.) In this fifth and last verbal conflict Jesus turns on his opponents with a question. He swings over from defense to offense. But the aggression here loses its force through the purely academic character of the question.

Of the five conflicts this last is the least impressive. Not only the method of the reasoning but the subject matter makes one skeptical. Jesus is here represented as provoking public discussion of a theme and suggestion, the messianic issue, which otherwise in the first three Gospels he suppresses both in public and in private. The reasoning here is unlike anything that we meet elsewhere in the religious thinking of Jesus. Usually we see Jesus in his use of the Old Testament pressing his way directly to the religious heart of a passage. But here his use of Psalm 110:1 is technical and professional. In his use of the Old Testament in the preceding conflict Jesus appeared as a prophet, but here he is a schoolman. The argumentation is too Rabbinical, too subtle, too delicately membered. The terms are too carefully defined to be characteristic of Jesus. We do not find Jesus elsewhere insisting on such hair-splitting discriminations, reading special meanings into particular words. The passage makes no real contribution to our knowledge of Jesus or of the progress of the Jerusalem events.

11. *THE ADDRESS AGAINST THE SCRIBES AND PHARISEES.*

Matthew 23:1–39. *Mark* 12:38–40. *Luke* 20:45–47.

Tuesday of the passion week has been so eventful that we almost forget Mark's calendar of days. Thus far it has been taken up with the scene on the way into the city with Jesus' comments in connection with the withered fig tree and the series of five contentions in the temple. One principal feature of the day still remains — the two great discourses, the last utterances of Jesus in public. This is true of Matthew only, for Mark and Luke have only one great address on Tuesday evening, the address on the last things with which Matthew also closes the day.

At this point Matthew introduces a long discourse of Jesus, a scathing denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees whom Matthew has held in assembly during the last two conflicts. (22:34, 41.) This address consumes the whole of Matthew's chapter 23 and is one of the longest ascribed to Jesus. At this same point Mark (12:38–40) and Luke (20:45–47) also have Jesus turn on the scribes with a very cutting criticism, but in both it is just a brief utterance, a simple statement within the compass of a single sentence. The utterance is too brief in Mark and Luke to merit the name of an address. In a much earlier connection Luke reported substantially the same address that Matthew here reports — a series of denunciatory woes. (Luke 11:37–54.) Matthew's address, as well as that of Luke, consists chiefly of this series of woes, but Matthew greatly extends the address with other utterances of a denunciatory character.

This address has created problems both for Christians and for Jews. Both have been sensitive to the bitter harshness of these charges. Christians have sought to save the character of Jesus; Jews, the reputation of their religious leaders. The general disposition is to exonerate Jesus of these charges and the Pharisees of these vices at the expense of primitive Christianity and the prophetic strain in Jesus' personality.

Neither Christians nor Jews have been Jewish enough in their approach to this bitter denunciation. We have here essentially a Jewish situation — a Jewish prophet in combat with the forces of organized religion, by no means a new situation in the history of the Jewish people. Certain utterances may have been sharpened by later Christian bitterness, but in its general theme and tone the address is genuinely Jewish and prophetic. This type of attack on ingenuine religion goes back to the earliest prophets. The speech is no more uncontrolled in utterance and spirit than many passages in the prophetic writings. Jesus does not discriminate less nor does he generalize more than do the sixth- and eighth-century prophets when they hurl their sweeping charges against some class of their contemporaries or against the whole nation. The prophet is never pedant enough to note all exceptions, nor even the fact that the things he is denouncing are exceptions rather than the general rule.

Neither Jews nor Christians will find this address pleasant to their peculiar palates, but both must remember that the prophet is not always a pleasant person and that his popularity, if any, is usually short-lived for the very reason that his task, as he feels it upon himself, is not to be pleasant but to preach his message. We may prefer the prophet in his more pleasant moments, but if he has only pleasant moments and gentle gestures, he is not a real prophet, a Jewish prophet true to the type. Once we sense the genius of the prophet, the promptness and force of his reactions, we shall not think of asking whether all of these things were really true of all the scribes and Pharisees. Allowing for certain invasions from a later Christian situation, we may leave the address as Jesus' very own without compromising his character or that of the Pharisees as a class.

To what extent these bitter utterances figured in the Jerusalem drama and its development we are not in a position to say. The utterance in Mark and Luke is too brief to have made any great contribution. Matthew, however, seems to have attached more importance to it at this point. The very space he devotes to it would indicate this. "This bitter tirade of Jesus at the close of the Jerusalem conflicts explains the hatred discharged in the passion story proper."[7] But this hatred in the trial and death scenes appears in Mark and Luke as well as in Matthew.

12. *THE WIDOW'S MITES.*

Mark 12:41–44. *Luke* 21:1–4.

Matthew omits this charming little story. Just why, we do not know unless his interest is so commanded by his great discourse section in chapters 23, 24 and 25 that he simply passes over it to avoid an interruption. Mark and Luke report the story in the same place and in practically the same words.

The whole scene is an observation of Jesus and his disciples who watch the poor widow's pantomime, for she speaks not a word and seems wholly unconscious of the presence or observation of others. The story is all the more impressive because she has two mites; she might have retained one for herself. Jesus' comment on her deed is a paradox, and it recalls certain of his words in the Sermon on the Mount which judge acts by inner motive and purpose rather than by outward expression. Jesus seems to set a holy seal on every worthy impulse that inspires men, no matter how small, how insignificant its expression.

---

[7] J. Weiss, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments,* I 180.

13. *THE PROPHECY OF THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE.*

Matthew 24:1–2. *Mark* 13:1–2. *Luke* 21:5–6.

In Matthew this passage is simply a transition from the address against the scribes and Pharisees (23) to the address on the last things (24–25). In Mark and Luke no such long address precedes and this passage furnishes a natural swing from the story of the widow in the temple to a setting and occasion for the long address on the last things that follows. In Matthew and Mark Jesus is leaving the temple. In Luke, however, the temple remains the scene for all that has preceded and for all that follows on this day. In Matthew and Mark Jesus' forecast is in private; in Luke it seems to be generally public.

The genuineness of this word of Jesus has been debated, but some such statement of Jesus must have had currency in earliest Christian circles. One such figures in the false witness in the Jewish trial in Matthew (26:61) and Mark (14:58) and in the taunts at the cross in both (Matt. 27:39–40; Mark 15:29–30). It is not this word but another which has to do with Jesus destroying the temple and building it again in three days. The Fourth Gospel puts it on the lips of Jesus (2:19) with a special interpretation of his body as the temple that will rise after three days. In the charges against Stephen (Acts 2:13–14) we read that he is reported to have said that " this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place."

14. *THE ADDRESS ON THE LAST THINGS.*

Matthew 24:3–25:46. *Mark* 13:3–37. *Luke* 21:7–36.

We come now to the closing incident of Tuesday of the passion week, the last great address ascribed to Jesus in the first three Gospels. We recall that Matthew reported another long address on this day, against the scribes and Pharisees, while Mark and Luke had only a single simple statement. In Matthew and Mark we have the final shift of scene on this third day, from the temple to the Mount of Olives overlooking the city. In Luke the scene remains the temple, as it has been for all of his matter parallel to Mark's Tuesday of the passion week. Luke did not have Jesus leaving the temple in the preceding passage. (21:5–6.) Mark has the address delivered to a very limited group, the four fisherman disciples first called in 1:16–20. Matthew has all of the disciples. (24:3.) Luke has an indefinite " they," the temple public, but the very character of the materials in his address shows that it is intended for intimate followers.

All three Gospel writers report the address at just this point. Luke, however, reported another form in a much earlier connection. (17:20–37.) Matthew's form of the address here is twice as long as that of Mark and Luke due to the fact that he combines the main body of the Markan materials with materials that parallel Luke's first form (17:20–37), and to this combined form he adds materials found only in his Gospel or out of all association with either form of this address in Luke. (Matt. 24:43–25:46.)

This is the longest single address that Mark puts on the lips of Jesus, almost the whole of chapter 13. The Markan addresses otherwise are only a few verses in length. The theme of the address is one quite common in the religious thinking of ancient peoples — the collapse of the present world-order and the appearance of a new, ideal age and condition that will realize all elemental human hopes.

The general framework of the picture is Jewish. In its detail it has now no natural literary or logical unity. The whole leaves the impression that it was written to be read rather than delivered by Jesus, any Christian or Jew, orally. Certainly this chapter of Mark has had a history. In its thought the address presents a composite body of matter with three very different and distinct strains. First, some passages are wholly Jewish, of Jewish extraction and origin. Second, a very few passages suggest the style and thought of Jesus. Third, other passages are the products of later Christian experience and adversity. But all this matter, whether of Jewish origin or genuine words of Jesus, appears here under Christian adoption. Much of it represents a common ground on which apocalyptic Judaism, Jesus and primitive Christianity stood.

No address ascribed to Jesus is stranger to us to-day, more foreign to our modern feeling and faith. No address put on his lips in the first three Gospels contains fewer of his genuine words. Yet the whole pictures an atmosphere as old as the book of Daniel and that fed

Jewish minds and hearts in Jesus' own day. He himself breathed this atmosphere deep and strong as we see in numerous utterances outside of this particular section. His followers, for a generation at least, held firmly to this fantastic picture in which the returning and triumphant Jesus was the central figure. But the address, as a whole or in part, is not an integral element in the Jerusalem drama that cost Jesus his life.

15. *JESUS LODGES OUTSIDE THE CITY.*

Luke 21:37–38.

With this notice Luke gives us a sort of survey of Jesus' activity during the passion week — the days spent teaching in the temple, a repetition of 19:47a, and the nights spent outside the city, a notice that we met earlier in Mark (11:19). Luke has not distinguished these public days one from the other as Mark has, yet even here we feel that something is over, a turn of events is coming, and Luke summarizes here on all that has taken place thus far in the Holy City.

It is interesting to note that Luke mentions the Mount of Olives as the lodging place of Jesus. Bethany is associated with only one incident in Luke's passion story, the pilgrim demonstration on Palm Sunday. In Matthew and Mark Bethany stands out as the lodging place of Jesus. Nights he retreats thither; there he is anointed on Wednesday.

Only on the last night do we find Jesus within the city walls, at the supper table, and this scene is followed by a retreat to Gethsemane. Why did Jesus retreat from the city each evening? Are these retreats just circumstantial, or are they a part of the passion drama? Some think that Jesus retreated each night out of consideration for his own personal safety. In Bethany the high authorities would not have him within such ready reach. Others think that purely personal reasons took him to Bethany. There was a friendly home there that offered him hospitality during the feast. Still others are of the opinion that these retreats are purely circumstantial. Thousands of pilgrims came up to the Holy City for its festivals, and especially for the Passover. Josephus tells us that all could not be accommodated within the city and its surrounding villages and that many were forced to spend the nights in the open. In Matthew and Mark we might think that Jesus and his group could not find accommodations within the city itself but were able to do so in Bethany. In Luke, however, we might think that Jesus and his disciples, like many others perhaps, spent the nights in the open on the Mount of Olives.

. . . . .

At last the third day of the passion week comes to a close. With this one day the first three Gospel writers have associated the great body of materials on Jesus' public work in Jerusalem. It has been chiefly a day of verbal combat with Jesus' enemies seeking to involve him in delicate discussions that might furnish a case against him. This ruse has not been successful, and the day closes with Jesus a victor over his opponents. He has been prudent in his statements, but he has made no concessions or compromises. The embarrassment of his enemies is clear on the following day. It is only with an unexpected turn of events, the appearance of a traitor from within Jesus' own trusted group, that the Jerusalem authorities take the definite steps that lead to the abrupt and catastrophic end.

The public ministry of Jesus is over. The first three days in the Holy City — Sunday, Monday, Tuesday — were in public. The three days left — Wednesday, Thursday, Friday — are taken up for the most part with private and intimate scenes. The passion story proper, the rapid culmination of the drama, is ready to begin.

CHAPTER IV

WEDNESDAY

WEDNESDAY

	Matthew	Mark	Luke	
1 The Conspiracy of the Chief Priests[a]	26:1–5	14:1–2	22:1–2	
2 The Anointing in Bethany[b]	6–13	3–9	......	*Lk 7:36–50*
3 Judas Betrays Jesus[c]	14–16	10–11	3–6	

[a] John 11:47–53.
[b] John 12:1–8.
[c] John 13:2, 27.

THE fourth day of the passion week is very clearly set off in Mark 14:1–11. This passage is very brief in view of the long section devoted to the preceding day, Tuesday. In Mark and Matthew (26:1–16) the day includes three incidents — the conspiracy of the chief priests, the anointing in Bethany and the betrayal by Judas. In Luke 22:1–6 only the first and third incidents remain. The anointing Luke does not associate with this day or with the passion week at all. He reported it as a part of his Galilean story. (7:36–50.) Luke's account of the events of Wednesday is more natural than that of Matthew and Mark, for the story of the anointing really interrupts the natural connection between the plot and the appearance of Judas. In Luke these two passages stand immediately together without break. Mark 14:1–2 and 10–11 belong together and should be read together as a continuous narrative; also Matthew 26:1–5 and 14–16. The anointing does not necessarily belong to this day as Matthew and Mark report it. If we are to include it in this particular day, it should be made to precede the plot in Mark 14:1–2 or to follow the appearance of Judas in 14:10–11. It should not intervene.

In Matthew and Mark this day is spent in private.

Jesus and his disciples are in Bethany. There is no visit to the city itself as on the first three days. Luke gives us no hint as to the exact whereabouts of Jesus on this particular day. The last we heard was of nightly retreats to the Mount of Olives. (21:37–38.) In Luke's briefer account of the day Jesus does not appear as a speaker or actor, and the drama in all three Gospels moves ahead not by what Jesus says and does but by the plot of his enemies and the betrayal by one of his trusted disciples. It is at this point that the passion story proper begins. Montefiore, from the liberal Jewish point of view, remarks that it " is not only told with consummate distinction and beauty, but gives the impression of well-ordered narrative."[1]

1. *THE CONSPIRACY OF THE CHIEF PRIESTS.*
Matthew 26:1–5. *Mark* 14:1–2. *Luke* 22:1–2.

With Mark 14:1 we are two days before the Passover, thus, on Wednesday. This Markan notice Matthew (26:1) converts into a word of Jesus for the sake of a final forecast of the fatal outcome. Luke as usual shows no interest in the exact day and simply remarks that the Passover is nigh. (22:1.) This dating has caused a great deal of debate among critics relative to the date of Jesus' death. In all four Gospels Jesus dies on a Friday. His body is taken down from the cross and hastily laid in a nearby tomb in order that the approaching Sabbath may not be defiled. In the first three Gosepls Jesus seems to die on the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, having eaten the Passover meal with his disciples on Thursday evening which was the beginning of the Jewish Friday. The Fourth Gospel, however, has Jesus die a day earlier, on the fourteenth of the Jewish month of Nisan instead of the fifteenth as in the first three Gospels. In the Fourth Gospel Jesus and his disciples do not eat the Passover but have a private supper on the last night, twenty-four hours in advance.

---

[1] *The Synoptic Gospels,* I 307. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company.

The crucifixion on the feast day as reported by the first three Gospels creates all sorts of difficulties and improbabilities. The arrest, the assembly and death-sentence of the Jewish legal body, the execution — all would defile this holiest of festivals. Both Jews and Romans, who were careful not to offend unnecessarily Jewish religious sentiment, would make themselves and the day unclean. Consequently a number of scholars, who otherwise have a pronounced preference for the first three Gospels, reject their dating of Jesus' death in favor of the Fourth Gospel, according to which Jesus is arrested, tried and put to death before the beginning of the feast proper. Those who retain the dating of the first three Gospels point out the theological program of the Fourth Gospel's date: Jesus is made to die on the day when the Passover lamb was slain, thus becoming the ultimate sacrifice, the Lamb of God offered up once for all, the eternal Passover.

The problem of the date of Jesus' death will remain unsolved unless new light comes to our aid. The dating in the first three Gospels has great difficulties to overcome, but the very considerations used against it may be the best evidence of its truth and reliability. Could the tradition of Jesus' death on this great and holy day have ever originated and survived if it had been false? The earliest Christian tradition has Jesus eating the Passover on the last night, arrested, tried, put to death and his body laid in a tomb before the close of the first day of this Jewish feast. It is difficult to account for the irregularities, but it is even more difficult to explain the rise of a false dating. The Fourth Evangelist writes at a much later date when theological ventures were possible and, after having seen him take so many liberties with the story of Jesus, the matter of his death a day in advance of that given in the first three Gospels is not surprising. We have no way of gauging the feeling of Jesus' enemies in their death-sentence upon him, but it must have been exceedingly bitter in the closing scenes. Jesus may have been the victim of religious fanaticism. It may have been a case of the old axiom, "The better the day, the better the deed." Extraordinary circumstances may have required extraordinary measures.[2]

Turning to the conspiracy itself, we see that Mark does not represent the chief priests and scribes as in formal session; they come to an informal yet very definite determination upon Jesus' death. According to Matthew, however, the authorities are in official session with formal legal action against Jesus. Luke's notice of the conspiracy here is not different from earlier plans and plots. (19:47b–48.) Also he shows no interest in their motives and cautions.

---

[2] Cf. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels,* I 314.

Whether the consideration of the chief priests expresses a motive or a caution is not clear. "Not during the feast, lest haply there be a tumult of the people." If it is a motive, fearing that trouble will be started by Jesus or his followers, then they plan to do away with him before the feast. Prompt action will nip any plans in the bud. If it expresses a caution, then they are thinking that his arrest might cause a revolt among the people. Their caution, too, may include a consideration for the sacredness of the festival which must not be defiled by arrests, trials and executions. Some think that the chief priests intend to wait until the feast is past and the pilgrims are dispersed to their homes. "But meanwhile something happened which hastened Jesus' arrest and death"[3]—the appearance of Judas, which should follow at once upon this scene in Matthew and Mark as it does in Luke.

In the Fourth Gospel this plot is not a part of the last six days. (11:47–53.) It precedes by a number of days at least the anointing in Bethany (12:1–8) and the triumphal entry into the Holy City (12:12–19). The Fourth Evangelist agrees with the first in having a formal session and decision of the chief priests; also he names

---

[3] Klausner, *Jesus of Narareth,* p. 324.

Caiaphas as the high priest, but presents him as the principal instigator against Jesus' life. The motive of the conspiracy is also different in the Fourth Gospel. It grows out of Jesus' wonder-works, especially the raising of Lazarus. (11:1–44.) In the Fourth Gospel Caiaphas acts on grounds of political prudence and expediency; it is better for one man to die than for a whole people to perish.

This plot against Jesus is final in the first three Gospels. It results in his death two days later, but it seems to have owed its success to unexpected aid from an unexpected quarter — to an act of betrayal by one of Jesus' intimate and trusted followers.

2. *THE ANOINTING IN BETHANY.*

Matthew 26:6–13. *Mark* 14:3–9.

The correct location of the story of the anointing of Jesus is uncertain. Matthew and Mark include it at this point as the principal event of the fourth day of the passion week. It may have belonged to this day, but in its present place it interrupts the natural progress of the narrative in both Matthew and Mark — the plot of the chief priests and the appearance of Judas which belong immediately together. The uncertainty of the story's proper location is increased by the other two Gospel writers. The Fourth Evangelist keeps the anointing in the Jerusalem days and in Bethany, but he has it come six days before the Passover instead of two days before as it does in Matthew and Mark. He also has it precede the triumphal entry by a day, while in the first and second Gospels it comes on Wednesday following Palm Sunday. (John 12:1–8, 12–19.) Luke's account is still more confusing, for he assigns the incident to the Galilean story in which it is far removed from any association with the village of Bethany and the passion week. (7:36–50.)

Just when and where the anointing took place we cannot say. The interruption in Mark's story at this point, between 14:1–2 and 10–11, makes it clear that it is an insertion. It is the dramatic quality of the incident apparently that appeals to Mark and that leads him to insert it at just this point. The story is beautiful in its sentiment and setting. It serves as an impressive prologue that sets the theme and tone for the drama that follows. At this point at least we meet Mark in the rôle of a dramatist.

The account of the anointing is very much the same in both Matthew and Mark. The scene is set in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper. The woman who anoints Jesus is unnamed, a rather strange fact when we consider the closing comment of Jesus about the permanent memorial to her. No reflection is cast on the woman's character. She is not a penitent person but one who pays a personal tribute in honor of the Master. She anoints Jesus' head. The indefinite " some " who make the invidious remark about the waste of the ointment in the second Gospel become " the disciples " in Matthew. Mark estimates the worth of the ointment around three hundred shillings; Matthew says simply " much." The entire scene pictures an extravagance, but the very temper of the story makes the reader feel that it is wholly appropriate.

Just what Jesus' words were on this occasion we have no way of finding out. The utterances ascribed to him are of Christian origin. They are framed to fit their present position as a sort of introduction to the passion drama. If they are based on any statements of his, later Christian interpretation obscures their true sense. This tribute Jesus may have let pass without comment as he did the cries of the crowds on Palm Sunday.

Luke's account of the anointing of Jesus (7:36–50) is wholly different, so different in fact that the anointing itself might just as well drop out. In Matthew and Mark the entire interest centers on Jesus; it is Christocentric. It is a personal tribute to Jesus and it is associated with his approaching suffering and death. In Luke, however, the idea of a tribute falls into the background and none of Jesus' words suggests an association with his death. The early place which Luke gives the story would break this association which is so natural in Matthew and Mark with Jesus' death only two days away. In Luke all interest centers on the woman and her act as an expression of her feeling of repentance and need of forgiveness. Jesus, too, in his comments associates her act with her penitence and the forgiveness of her sins. Apparently he finds in her act no suggestion of a tribute to himself, no anticipation of the anointing of his body for burial.

There is really very little in common between the account of Luke and that of Matthew and Mark except details. Luke has Simon the Pharisee over against Simon the leper. The woman remains unnamed in Luke, but she is a sinful woman. Luke has an objection, not to the waste of the ointment, but from Jesus' host regarding the character of the woman. Luke does not make a point of the costliness of the ointment; the woman anoints Jesus' feet, not his head. Any extravagance in Luke's account is in the actions of the woman — her tears wiped off his feet with the hair of her head, and her kisses — not in the breaking of a precious cruse and the pouring out of costly ointment. In Luke Jesus has no words for the poor, no memorial for the woman. Instead he offers a defense of her conduct, and the scene closes with Jesus assuring the woman of the forgiveness of her sins.

The idea of an anointing seems foreign really to the central theme of Luke's story in 7:36–50. Originally the cruse and the ointment did not figure; both probably came from later confusions with the Markan form of the story. Luke's account told originally a simple Galilean incident in which a sinful woman approached Jesus as he dined in the house of Simon the Pharisee; her tears fell on his feet, and she wiped them off with the hair of her head and kissed them dry. It was the simple and sincere act of a penitent woman to whom Jesus assured the divine forgiveness.

The account of the anointing in the Fourth Gospel is dependent upon the earlier accounts, particularly Mark and Luke. The Fourth Evangelist retains Bethany as the scene, however, six days before the Passover. It takes place in the home of Mary and Martha and Lazarus. It is a supper scene with Martha serving — an extract from Luke 10:38–42. Lazarus is present — a name supplied by Luke's only named character in a parable. (16:19–31.) The unnamed woman disappears and it is the beloved Mary who anoints Jesus, but she anoints his feet and wipes them with the hair of her head as in Luke's form of the story. These three names were suggested to the Fourth Evangelist by the close association between his accounts of the raising of Lazarus (11:1–44) and the anointing (12:1–8). The invidious remark about the waste of the ointment is ascribed to Judas. His name was probably suggested by the fact that the anointing in Mark (14:3–9) is followed at once by the betrayal (14:10–11). The three hundred shillings the Fourth Evangelist takes from Mark. The detail of the odor of the ointment filling the house is new. Jesus' words in the Fourth Gospel on this occasion are chiefly from Mark — the anticipation of his burial, the presence of the poor always, and his own speedy departure. The Fourth Gospel omits the memorial to the unnamed woman, for who could forget this act of the beloved Mary?

Just what relation the anointing of Jesus bore to the rest of the story we cannot determine exactly. Its association with the passion week is of such early and long standing that it would be difficult for us to conceive of it in any other connection. In spite of the fact that it appears in Matthew and Mark as a parenthetical passage interrupting the plot of Jesus' enemies and the coming of Judas, its very temper, theme and treatment make it a fitting introduction to the passion drama.

3. *JUDAS BETRAYS JESUS.*

Matthew 26:14–16. *Mark* 14:10–11. *Luke* 22:3–6.

The authorities are gathered together definitely plotting the end of the Galilean upstart who dared cleanse the temple. So far as they are concerned his fate is sealed. The only consideration is the imminent feast. (Mark 14:1–2.) But even while they are plotting, events take an unexpected turn — one of the Galilean's own followers appears and betrays him into their hands. (Mark 14:10–11.) Jesus, like other great men of history, was brought to death through the disloyalty of one of his own trusted followers.

The account of Judas' act here is very simple, too simple, for it leaves so much unsaid that we feel we are in need of knowing. This is the first personal appearance of Judas in the story in the first three Gospels. Down to this point he has never figured as a speaker or actor. We have had thus far only the mention of his name as the last in the list of the twelve.[4] Judas' act, then, comes like a flash of lightning out of a clear sky.

Mark introduces Judas as " one of the twelve," the usual New Testament introduction, suggesting that the early Christians were specially sensitive on just this point. Mark tells of Judas' act in a most straightforward manner. He seems to know nothing of the motives that moved him to betray his Master. He makes no apology for the traitor and his act; he leaves Judas a free agent, bearing the full responsibility for his deed. Mark does not tell us in just what the betrayal consisted but he leaves the impression with his readers that Judas told the authorities something that made them glad, something apparently that furnished them with a case against Jesus — the thing that they have been seeking without success in the verbal combats. Mark does not portray Judas as bargaining. The money appears more as an afterthought of the authorities than as an actuating motive of Judas.

---

[4] Matt. 10:4; Mark 3:19; Luke 6:16.

The accounts of Matthew and Mark are not substantially different except in one or two respects. In Matthew Judas remains a responsible agent. The idea of his furnishing damaging information against Jesus is less prominent. Matthew elaborates on the motive of Judas: he betrayed his Master for money. In Matthew he actually bargains with the chief priests, and they pay him in advance. Thus the afterthought of the authorities in Mark becomes the commanding motive of Judas in the first Gospel. Only Matthew within the New Testament gives the amount of money Judas received for his deed, the thirty pieces of silver. (Zechariah 11:12.)

Luke agrees with Mark in the idea of Judas' furnishing incriminating evidence against Jesus and in the money as an afterthought. But Luke at the very outset apologizes for Judas; he is really not responsible for his deed; Satan entered into him; he was possessed, no longer a free agent but the helpless victim of sinister powers. The betrayal of Jesus then becomes really the work of Satan; Judas is just his victimized tool. Judas in Luke is to be pitied rather than blamed for his deed. Luke, as well as the Fourth Evangelist, acquits Judas on a theological technicality.

This brings us face to face with the Judas-Jesus problem, for the figure of Judas with his mysterious rôle in the story of Jesus has always been a problem. Christians, early and late, have found in Judas a stumbling-stone of offense. Some of the Gospel writers, as well as modern biographers, have felt that they must deal with Judas and give some sort of explanation for his deed.

No Christian writer has showed himself more sensitive to this Judas-Jesus problem than the Fourth Evangelist. That Judas created a problem for him is clear from the frequency with which he introduces Judas in particular and hints in a general way at the presence of a betrayer in the little company. The Judas-Jesus problem as sensed and solved by the Fourth Gospel, in its own way, of course, may be stated in the form of a double question — a form of the problem that dominated all treatments of Judas down to the beginning of the twentieth century.

In the first place, *Why did Judas betray Jesus?* Matthew told us that Judas' motive was mercenary; he bartered away his Master's life for money. But after reading the accounts of Judas' act in Mark and Luke in which the money appears as an afterthought of the chief priests rather than as a moving motive of Judas, we are skeptical of Matthew's picture in this respect. The Fourth Evangelist, on the other hand, gets at the moral side of the problem by blackening the character of Judas. Often in the course of his story he introduces Judas, and always he appears in an evil light. All the way through the Fourth Evangelist assures his readers that Judas was thoroughly bad. In 6:70–71 he has Jesus speak of Judas as a devil and in 17:12 as "the son of perdition." It was the devil that put the thought of betrayal in Judas' heart. (13:2–27.) He appears as the villain at the anointing in Bethany. He it is who says that the ointment has been wasted, that it might have been sold for much and given to the poor. (12:5.) But the Fourth Evangelist assures us in the next verse (12:6) that Judas did not care for the poor, that really he was a thief and stole from the common funds. In the Fourth Gospel we are not surprised when Judas betrays his Master for we have learned to know him as a thoroughly bad person.

In the second place, *Why did Jesus ever choose Judas?* In answer to this question the Fourth Evangelist is eager to save Jesus from an error of judgment. From the outset Jesus knows that Judas will betray him (6:64); Jesus was not misled. He "knew what was in man" in general

(2:25) and in Judas in particular (13:10–11). The Fourth Evangelist gives no account of the choosing of the twelve disciples, but he has Jesus tolerate Judas in his company in order that the Scriptures might be fulfilled — just what Scripture is uncertain in 17:12, but in 13:17 it is the classic passage on vicious treachery — Psalm 41:9. In the Fourth Gospel Judas does not enjoy his Master's confidence, and Jesus is always, in private words to the disciples, discriminating against him. "Ye are clean, but not all." (13:10.) But in all of his attention to the Judas-Jesus problem the Fourth Evangelist gives us really no key to the services that Judas rendered the enemies of Jesus and by which he betrayed him to death.

Modern biographers in the main have followed the lines of the Fourth Gospel in the framing of the Judas-Jesus problem, giving special attention to the moral side of Judas and his act. They speak of Judas as the only one of the twelve who was not a Galilean (because of his name, Iscariot, supposing that it points to the Judean town of Kriyoth as his home). They suspect that he joined the company of Jesus only during the last days and consequently he never came really to understand Jesus as did the naturally sympathetic Galileans in the group. Others speak of growing disappointments and disillusionments of Judas in Jesus' words and deeds, of a cooling of his early enthusiasm, of his ultimate desperation in betraying the man who had misled and disappointed his hopes of him. Still others see in Judas a sympathetic follower to the very end; he simply misunderstood Jesus and betrayed him in order to force his hand and make him establish this long-announced kingdom. A few have gone so far as to portray Judas as the special friend of Jesus, the beloved disciple, who by his "betrayal," prearranged with Jesus himself, brought it to pass that he might be put to death on just the day when the Passover lamb was slain, thus becoming the eternal sacrifice.

But none of these attempts, whether of the Fourth Gospel or the modern lives of Jesus, is specially impressive when we turn to the earliest account, Mark, where the details concerning Judas and his deed are and remain doubtful and we have only the one certain fact that he did betray his Master. Mark gives us no answer to the question, Why did Judas betray Jesus? After reading Judas' name as the last in the list of the twelve in Mark 3:19 we do not hear of him again until 14:10–11 when he is in the very act of betraying Jesus. Mark has not prepared his readers for this treacherous thing, a traitor within the trusted circle of the twelve. We have had no account of Judas' calling; we have heard nothing of the circumstances of his joining the company of Jesus, nothing of his life prior to that time. We have never been told of any growing disappointments of Judas in the following of Jesus, of any disillusionment or dissatisfaction that brought about a breach between him and his Master. Mark has never once cast a reflection on the character of Judas by anything this disciple has said or done, for he has said or done nothing down to this point. The same is generally true of Matthew and Luke save that Matthew now introduces the mercenary motive and Luke the idea of the betrayal as the work of Satan through Judas.

Mark, as well as Matthew and Luke, gives no answer to the question, Why did Jesus ever choose Judas? There is no attempt to save Jesus from an error of judgment or to have him know from the first that there is a betrayer, just who he is and just what he will do. It is only at the supper table on the last night that the first hint of a traitor falls from Jesus' lips.[5] Down to this point in the first three Gospels Jesus has never discriminated against Judas or any member of the twelve. There is no hint to the effect that he did not give this disciple the same spontaneous confidence that he gave the rest. Certainly Judas was one with the twelve when Jesus sent them on their mission.[6] We should suppose that Jesus chose Judas for the same reason that he chose the rest of his intimate group, and that in Judas he met with the same disappointment eventually that other great men have met, particularly those who have found it easy to trust others impartially.

It is only in the present century that we are beginning to press close to the heart of the Judas-Jesus problem. In 1901 Albert Schweitzer framed the question to read, *What did Judas betray?* This new framing marks a real advance, for Judas must have put into the hands of the Jerusalem authorities certain secret facts, certain incriminating information that enabled them to make a case against Jesus. This is suggested in Mark's notice to the effect that the chief priests were glad. But just what were the services of Judas? The older ideas that he betrayed Jesus' nightly place of retreat (John 18:2), that he served as a guide (Acts 1:16), or that he identified Jesus are no longer impressive. We must seek out something that might have had an actual bearing on the events themselves and that would account for the promptness with which the authorities proceed after the appearance of Judas, for the death of Jesus is hardly more than forty-eight hours away.

---

[5] Matt. 26:21–25; Mark 14:18–21; Luke 22:21–23.

[6] Matt. 9:35–11:1; Mark 6:6b–13; Luke 9:1–6.

Albert Schweitzer proposes that Judas betrayed the messianic secret. This view is impressive, for the messiahship appears as the crux of the Jewish and Roman hearings. In the Jewish trial the authorities seem to extract from Jesus a messianic confession and they condemn him to death for blasphemy. In the Roman trial his alleged messianic claim, so construed by his Jewish accusers, is presented in a political light. This view of Albert Schweitzer relates itself better to what follows than to what precedes, for in Mark we have met with no open messianic claim of Jesus and on the basis of Mark's Gospel it is nowhere quite certain that Jesus regarded himself as the Messiah. To say that Judas betrayed the messianic conviction and claim of his Master goes really beyond what the sources warrant. It would be better perhaps to say that Judas betrayed the messianic conviction of the twelve concerning their Master. Since the later Galilean days this messianic conception of their Master has made sporadic appearances — in Simon's confession for the group (Mark 8:27–30) and in the request of James and John (Mark 10:35–41), but an open avowal on the part of Jesus himself has nowhere appeared in Mark and Luke, only in Matthew (16:13–20).[7] If the Jerusalem authorities learned from Judas that messianic ideas and hopes were stirring within Jesus' following, this would furnish plausible material enough to proceed with his arrest and to institute legal procedure against him.

Professor Bacon, of Yale University, has made the interesting suggestion that Judas betrayed the anointing in Bethany, an incident that was full of messianic suggestions and associations for Judas and the enemies of Jesus.[8] It was this fact that was used as a case against him. This theory has plausibilities but it would be much more impressive if we could assure ourselves that the anointing belongs at just this particular point in the Jerusalem story and is not just an interpolation for dramatic effect.

We have no adequate solution for the Judas-Jesus problem. The sources are simply too uncommunicative. Judas as an actor in the story is a psychological puzzle, a moral mystery. The fact that he betrayed his Master into the hands of his enemies seems quite certain. His motives, however, were his own at the time, and they still are. We have no way of reconstructing them. His betrayal of his Master seems to have been thorough and complete. The action that follows is prompt and rapid — within two brief days Jesus hangs dead on the cross.

---

[7] On this complicated question of the messianic materials in the Gospels, *see* Bundy, *Our Recovery of Jesus*, pp. 213–256.

[8] "What Did Judas Betray?" *Hibbert Journal*, April, 1921.

. . . . .

It is on Wednesday, then, that the real tragedy begins. The fate of Jesus is sealed because his enemies, determined upon his death, receive some unexpected but real aid from a man within the trusted company. Just what incriminating evidence Judas furnished we are not in a position to say, but judging from the Jewish and Roman hearings that follow it must have been primarily of a messianic nature — personal convictions of Jesus himself or, more probably, those of his group concerning him.

CHAPTER V

THURSDAY

THURSDAY

	Matthew	Mark	Luke
1 The Preparation of the Passover	26:17–19	14:12–16	22:7–13

WITH Mark 14:12 we are on the fifth day of the passion week, our Thursday. Mark's notice really seems to include two different days in the Jewish feast calendar, "on the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the Passover." The Passover lamb was slain and prepared *toward sunset* of the fourteenth of the Jewish month of Nisan (Ex. 12:6; Lev. 23:5–6) and the fifteenth, the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, began just *after the same sunset.* Friday in the Jewish reckoning began with sunset of our Thursday. For non-Jewish readers, then, the preparation of the Passover lamb and the beginning of the feast of unleavened bread would fall on one and the same day, our Thursday afternoon and evening. Luke gives us his first definite dating in his passion story. (22:7.)

The account of this fifth day is very brief in the first three Gospels. Among the six days of the passion week Thursday, closing at sunset, is the least eventful of all. It includes a single incident — the sending of the disciples into the Holy City to prepare for the feast that began on the same evening. As on Wednesday, Jesus himself does not go into the city. He remains in his place of retreat (Bethany in Matthew and Mark) and goes into the city only in the evening. The Fourth Gospel has no parallel to this single incident on this day, for in the Fourth Gospel Jesus does not eat the Passover but is arrested before the preparation begins and dies on the cross at the very time when the preparation for the Passover was in progress (18:28).

1. *THE PREPARATION OF THE PASSOVER.*

Matthew 26:17–19. *Mark* 14:12–16. *Luke* 22:7–13.

According to Matthew and Mark the disciples take the initiative in suggesting the preparation of the Passover. In Luke, however, it is Jesus who orders the Passover prepared. In Mark he sends two unnamed disciples; in Luke it is Peter and John, the apostolic pair of the early chapters of Acts; in Matthew we might think that he sent all of the disciples.

In this incident we meet a close parallel to the preparation for the triumphal entry.[1] In Mark and Luke here we find the same mysterious, miraculous element that we met there, the same sort of detailed prediction of what the disciples will find — the man bearing the pitcher of water, the large upper room furnished and ready — the same sort of instructions as to how they are to conduct themselves, what they are to say, and finally both Mark and Luke emphasize the fact that the disciples find everything just as Jesus said they would.

It is interesting to note, too, that Matthew eliminates the mysterious, miraculous element here as he did in the sending for the colt. He omits all the predicted details about the man with the pitcher and the furnished room. At the close he emphasizes the fact that the disciples did as Jesus told them to do, not that they found everything just as he said in advance.

---

[1] Matt. 21:1–9; Mark 11:1–10; Luke 19:29–38.

In Mark and Luke we get the impression that the master of the house is learning of Jesus' intention to eat the Passover under his roof for the first time; there have been no prearrangements between him and Jesus. But in Matthew the whole plan seems to have been prearranged between Jesus and the master of the house. He simply sends his disciples to " such a man " in the city with a sort of code message that he will at once understand, " My time is at hand; I keep the Passover at thy house with my disciples." (26:18.)

The preparation for the Passover does not leave with us the unfavorable impression that the preparation for the triumphal entry left. The preparation here is more natural, nothing is being staged as there, and it was a regular part of the events leading up to the feast. The day preceding the first day of unleavened bread was set apart for removing all leaven from the house and the slaying and preparing of the Passover lamb. Even if we did not have this account, we might be quite certain what was going on within Jesus' group during this day, for in the next scene we find them together celebrating the Passover meal. The story has acquired a mysterious, miraculous element in Mark and Luke, but with this eliminated, as it is in Matthew, the account leaves otherwise only a natural and favorable impression.

Jesus and his group are here preparing to celebrate the most sacred of all Jewish festivals, the Passover. It throws important light on the table scene that follows. It is a Jewish occasion. Jesus and his group are Galilean Jews, Passover pilgrims. In spite of all the difficulties and improbabilities associated with Jesus' arrest, trial and death on this most sacred of feast days, the general import of the whole of the story in the first three Gospels is to the effect that Jesus and his group came to the Holy City at the season of the Passover, it was prepared for him, and on the last night of his life he ate the Passover in the closed company of his chosen companions. It is about this Jewish feast that the whole of the passion story centers. The tragedy that developed was the product of unforeseen circumstances, the nature of Jesus' activity in the Holy City itself and the bitterness of the Jerusalem opposition to his person and work.

CHAPTER VI

GOOD FRIDAY

Scene I

At the Table

GOOD FRIDAY

Scene 1. At the Table[a]

		Matthew	Mark	Luke		
1	At the Table with the Twelve[b]	26:20	14:17	22:14		
2	The Designation of the Betrayer[c]	21–25	18–21	....	*Lk 22:21–23*	
3	The Last Supper (Mt-Mkan text)	26–29	22–25	....		
4	The Passover Cup (Lkan A text)	....	....	15–18		
5	The Lord's Supper[d] (Paul-Lkan B text)	....	....	19–20	*I Cor. 11:23b–26*	
6	The Designation of the Betrayer[c]	....	....	21–23	*Mt 26:21–25*	*Mk 14:18–21*
7	A Contention Concerning Rank	....	....	24	*Mk 9:33–34*	*Lk 9:46*
8	Service as the Test of Greatness	....	....	25–27	*Mt 20:25–28*	*Lk 10:42–45*
9	Thrones for the Twelve	....	....	28–30	*Mt 19:28*	
10	Special Supplication for Simon	....	....	31–32		
11	Peter's Pledge — His Denial Foretold	....	....	33–34	*Mt 26:33–35*	*Mk 14:29–31*
12	Purse and Sword	....	....	35–38	*Lk 10:4a*	
13	On the Way to Gethsemane	30–32	26–28	39		
14	Peter's Pledge — His Denial Foretold	33–35	29–31	....	*Lk 22:33–34*	

---

[a] John 13–17.

[b] John 13:1–9.

[c] John 13:10–11, 21–30.

[d] John 6:52–59.

WITH the supper scene we come into the last twenty-four hours of Jesus' life. The time left is very short but the Gospel writers treat these last hours with great fulness and detail. This is the sixth and last day of the passion week, Good Friday. It begins with sundown of our Thursday, the supper scene falling on our Thursday evening which is the beginning of the Jewish Friday. And the story of Jesus comes to a close before the next sundown when his body is taken down from the cross and hastily laid in a nearby tomb because of the nearness of the Jewish Sabbath, our Saturday. This last day Christians, in that strange paradox typical of a religious faith that feels within itself a sense of triumph, have called *Good Friday*.

These last twenty-four hours fall into five scenes: the the supper, the Gethsemane struggle, the Jewish and Roman trials, and the crucifixion. None of the Gospel writers neglects any one of these five last scenes although there are differences in materials and treatment. Throughout the five Matthew and Mark have substantially the same account. Matthew omits very little of the Markan materials and supplies very little new matter of his own, just brief passages here and there. On the whole he treats these closing scenes just as Mark does, telling the same story in the same way, very often in identical language.

Luke, however, is not so loyal to the Markan pattern. He reports all five scenes in the Markan order and arrangement, but within particular scenes he takes great liberties. In fact, Luke's account of these last five scenes presents so many differences from Mark's account that many scholars are of the opinion that Luke is using a wholly different and independent story of the last hours.

In the Fourth Gospel these five final scenes remain intact. Some of them are greatly abbreviated, others greatly elaborated, over against the accounts in the first three Gospels. Important passages are omitted and a great body of wholly new matter comes in to take their place. All five of these scenes bear the stamp of the Fourth Evangelist's own peculiar treatment; many familiar features disappear and many new features come to the front. The account in the Fourth Gospel often is in open conflict with the general plan and treatment in the first three Gospels.

. . . . .

The supper scene is rather brief in Matthew (26:20–35) and Mark (14:17–31). It includes just two principal elements: the designation of the betrayer and the extension of the bread and the wine. With these two incidents all that Jesus says and does at the table is associated in the first two Gospels.

Luke's account of the supper scene is more elaborate. (22:14–39.) He reports the two incidents of Matthew and Mark, however, in reverse order: first, the extension of the bread and the wine; then, the designation of the betrayer. But Luke does not stop with these two incidents. He goes ahead to add a series of farewell words with which his supper scene closes. (22:24–39.) So far as these words have parallels in Matthew and Mark, they have earlier and different associations.

The Fourth Gospel has the most elaborate account of the things said and done at the table. To this one scene the author devotes five long chapters. (13–17.) The surprising thing is that his account of the supper scene has so little in common with that of the first three Gospels, only a single incident — the designation of the betrayer. (13:10–11, 21–30.) In the Fourth Gospel, too, the supper itself falls into the background. It is not the great feast of the Passover but a private meal twenty-four hours in advance. Jesus does not extend the bread and the wine as he does in the first three Gospels. This famous act drops out of the Fourth Gospel entirely, only a doctrinal discourse on eating Jesus' flesh and drinking his blood remains. (6:52–59.) Instead of the bread and the cup at the table Jesus as his last act for his disciples washes their feet as an object-lesson in humility. (13:1–20.) Then follows the famous farewell address, four long chapters (14–17), wholly new discourse matter with virtually no parallels in the first three Gospels.

1. *AT THE TABLE WITH THE TWELVE.*

Matthew 26:20. *Mark* 14:17. *Luke* 22:14.

It is our Thursday evening, the beginning of the Jewish Friday. Mark tells us that Jesus came with the twelve as though the disciples sent to prepare the Passover had rejoined Jesus in his place of retreat. This is Jesus' first visit to the city since leaving it on Tuesday evening. Wednesday and Thursday were spent in his place of retreat. It is only on this last night, the first and only night, that we find him in the Holy City itself, in the home of a Jerusalem friend eating the Passover meal. The fact that Jesus and his group go into the city to eat the Passover suggests that one of the old regulations was still in effect — the meal must be eaten within the city limits.

The ceremonial details of the Passover meal are uncertain, for they varied at different periods in Israel's history. According to the *Mishna* tractate *Pesahim,* the celebration began like the regular Sabbath meal with a blessing over a cup containing a mixture of red wine and water. This appears to have been followed by a brief word on the meaning of the feast by the head of the house. Then came a blessing, breaking and distribution of unleavened bread dipped with bitter herbs in a dish of specially prepared broth. Then the first half of the *Hallel* (Psalms 113–114) was sung, followed by a second cup. Then came the meal proper. After the meal the head of the house again blessed, brake and gave bread. Then came the third cup accompanied by the benediction, "Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God, thou who createst the fruit of the vine." A final, fourth cup was poured and the second half of the *Hallel* (Psalms 115–118) was sung.[1] It was this festival that brought Jesus and his group to Jerusalem.

2. *THE DESIGNATION OF THE BETRAYER.*
Matthew 26:21–25. *Mark* 14:18–21.

All four Gospels associate the designation of the betrayer with the supper scene. In Matthew and Mark it precedes the extension of the bread and the wine; in Luke it follows. In the Fourth Gospel (13:21–30) it follows the washing of the disciples' feet and the words on humility which come during the supper. (13:2.) Some are of the opinion that it was not originally a part of the supper scene at all but was inserted at this point for its dramatic qualities, making the whole scene more solemn and impressive.

The designation of the betrayer at the supper creates difficulties. Is it probable that Judas was at the table, a participant in this most intimate of all the scenes between Jesus and his group? Is it conceivable that he rejoined the company of Jesus after having betrayed him? After his betrayal of Jesus (Mark 14:10–11) he does not appear as an actor in the story in Mark and Luke (22:47–48) until he comes at the head of the mob that seizes Jesus in Gethsemane. (14:43–46.) In spite of these difficulties all four

---

[1] Klostermann, *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament,* I 118

Gospel writers seem to assume that the entire group of the twelve is present. In Matthew and the Fourth Gospel Judas figures personally in the scene.

We have here the first hint from the lips of Jesus in the first three Gospels that there is a betrayer in the trusted group. As readers we learned of Judas' act earlier, on Wednesday, but this is our first hint of Jesus' knowledge of what Judas has done. How he has learned of it we are not told. In Mark and Luke Jesus' word is perfectly general; there is nothing specific about it. Judas is not unmasked. Jesus says no more than that the betrayer is at the table. This is as near as he gets to the betrayer in Mark and Luke. But in Matthew the scene is carried a step farther. Judas is singled out and unmasked for the traitor that he is. To his question, "Is it I, Rabbi?" Jesus replies, "Thou hast said."

This unmasking of Judas in Matthew (and in the Fourth Gospel) is highly improbable. After the designation, the scene goes on as though Judas had not been exposed. In Matthew Judas does not leave the table as we should expect, and as he actually does in the Fourth Gospel. He stays on and shares in the sacrament of the bread and the wine, an inconceivable situation. The rest of the twelve seem to take no notice of what Judas has said or what Jesus says to him. They tolerate his continued presence at the table and make no effort to forestall his deed and plan.

The account of the exposure of Judas is even more elaborate and detailed in the Fourth Gospel, introducing new features and characters. Twice during the supper scene Jesus has hinted at the presence of the betrayer. (13:10–11, 18.) In 13:21–30 Jesus proceeds to point him out. Through the beloved disciple, who appears only in the Fourth Gospel and at this point for the first time (19:26–27; 20:2; 21:7–20), Simon Peter asks who the betrayer is. Jesus answers that it is the one to whom he shall give the sop dipped in the dish. He dips the sop and hands it to Judas with the challenge, "What thou doest, do quickly." This challenge is strange for it suggests that Judas has not yet betrayed Jesus, as he has on Wednesday in the first three Gospels, and that he has his treacherous work yet to do. It seems to be only at the table that treachery enters into the heart of Judas as a suggestion of Satan. (13:2, 27.) Further, this challenge makes Jesus the aggressor in the betrayal rather than the victim. Finally, this challenge is strange, for no one, not even Simon Peter or the beloved disciple who puts the question, seems to understand the import of the sop and Jesus' word to Judas. Some present at the table think that Jesus is sending Judas out to prepare for the approaching feast or to give something to the poor. But the incident does have a more logical conclusion in the Fourth Gospel than it does in Matthew for, after being exposed, at least for Jesus' mind, Judas leaves the table — and, the Fourth Evangelist adds a dramatic flourish, "it was night."

. . . . .

In the next three paragraphs we meet the three different New Testament accounts or texts of Jesus' last great act and words in the presence of his chosen disciples — the extension of the bread and wine. Each of the three accounts has special features all its own that distinguish it from the other two accounts. The first account is that of Matthew (26:26–29) and Mark (14:22–25) who agree almost verbatim, and we call their account the Matthew-Markan text. The second account we call the Lukan A text (22:15–18), for Luke seems to report two different texts in 22:15–20. The third we call the Pauline-Lukan B text because I Corinthians 11:23b–26 and Luke 22:19–20 give almost verbatim the same account. In the full text of Luke there are two cups (22:17–20), one before the supper and one after, the second corresponding to the only cup in the other accounts. The two cups in Luke suggest the conjunction of two accounts.

3. *THE LAST SUPPER.*

Matthew 26:26–29. *Mark* 14:22–25.

At just what point in the celebration of the Passover Jesus performs this act is not clear in Matthew and Mark. The Passover meal, as we saw, includes four cups and two blessings and breakings of bread. According to the first two Gospels Jesus extends first the bread and then the cup; both are brought into direct connection with Jesus' sacrificial death, and Matthew associates the cup with the forgiveness of sins. The account in the first two Gospels is primarily a simple narrative of an act of Jesus and his words in connection with it. There is no hint of an inauguration of a cult or ceremony to be repeated in the future in his personal memory. It is the Last Supper rather than the Lord's Supper. It is a private, personal, intimate occasion, a last farewell of Jesus with his group. The bread and the cup bind him to them and them to him. The original Jewish associations of the incident, the Passover meal, are virtually gone. The bread and the cup have lost their Jewish meanings and have become symbols of Christian feeling and faith.

At the very close we have a word of Jesus that certainly is the most genuine part of the whole. "Verily I say unto you, I shall no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God." (Mark 14:25.) Here all Christian symbolism and interpretation are dropped, and we have a simple and direct extract from the religious hope and outlook of Jesus. It consorts at once with companion utterances such as have appeared throughout the Gospel story. (Mark 1:15; Matt. 10:23; Mark 9:1.) Such an utterance gives us an intelligible notion of Jesus' meaning in extending the bread and the cup. The kingdom and its coming command him to the very end.

The supper scene is ended in Matthew and Mark. It has included only the designation of the betrayer and the extension of the bread and the wine. In the next verse of Matthew (26:30) and Mark (14:26) Jesus and the twelve leave the table for the Mount of Olives. In Luke, however, due to his reversal of the order of the two incidents in Matthew and Mark, we are just coming to the words of Jesus with which the supper scene opens.

4. *THE PASSOVER CUP.*

Luke 22:15–18.

This Lukan A text includes only the cup. However, Jesus in verse 15 speaks of eating the Passover in the same manner that he speaks of the bread in the other accounts. In this first text of Luke, then, we have the eating of the Passover and the drinking of the cup in the prospect of the imminent coming of the kingdom of God. Of the three accounts of this last act this first of Luke is the most unique and peculiar. The ideas of the later Christian cult do not appear. Jesus' words have a farewell tenor — death is just ahead — but the wine and the festival generally are not brought into any connection with his death as an atoning sacrifice. There is no hint of the inauguration of a religious rite to commemorate his death, to be repeated in his memory.

This Lukan A text emphasizes the Jewish character of the occasion. Jesus and his group are eating the Passover meal. His acts and words are Jewish; neither reflects the later Christian rites and theological interpretations. What he says and does relates itself in an organic way with all that he has heretofore represented. He eats the Passover, he extends one of its cups, with his feeling and faith in the coming of the kingdom running high. Before another Passover with its cups the kingdom of God will appear. He has looked forward to this Passover with genuine Jewish feeling and into its celebration he pours the entire substance of his hope and faith. The fact that he eats it, that he shares one of its cups, is his personal pledge that the kingdom he has announced from the first *will* come, and that soon. It is this special and peculiar text of Luke that relates itself best to all that we have learned to know of Jesus — his religious feelings, faith and hope relative to the appearing of God's great kingdom.

5. *THE LORD'S SUPPER.*

Luke 22:19–20. *I Cor.* 11:23b–26.

Paul in I Corinthians 11:23b–26 gives us our earliest written record of this last act of Jesus. It is removed from the time of Jesus's death by not more than twenty years and antedates the Gospel accounts by ten to twenty years. But in spite of its early date it is without doubt the farthest removed of the three texts from what Jesus said and did and meant on this last night. The Jewish character of the scene disappears entirely. All associations with the Passover are gone. Instead we have pure Christian ritual and liturgy. It is no longer in narrative style, recounting something said and done by Jesus, but it is phrased in the language and rhythm of the Christian cult of the Lord's Supper. It is, perhaps, our earliest extract from primitive Christian cult and ceremony. It is this liturgical text of

Paul (and Luke 22:19–20) that has found its way into the church's ritual used in the celebration of this rite.

This Pauline text has really nothing in common with the Lukan A text. It has been stripped of all association with Jesus' religious hope and outlook — the kingdom and its coming which we found to be the most genuine part of the other two texts. In I Corinthians 11:26 the religious outlook of Jesus has been converted into the early Christian hope: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come." In brief, this text has left in it virtually nothing of the religion of Jesus and seems to be wholly a product of primitive Christianity and its cult as ordained by its Lord. In common with the Matthew-Markan text this third relates the bread and the cup to Jesus' sacrificial death. The outstanding new feature is that Jesus is represented as establishing an institution, as inaugurating a religious sacrament, to be repeated in the future in his personal memory. Its celebration is regarded as enjoined by Jesus himself.

Luke 22:19–20 seems to have been taken over bodily from I Corinthians 11:23b–25, perhaps for the reason that Luke's first account, the simplest and most impressive of all, seemed so far removed from the Christian cult that would reproduce what Jesus said and did and meant on this last night.

. . . . .

When we survey these three divergent accounts of the bread and the cup we see that two of them, the Matthew-

Markan and the Pauline-Lukan B texts, give us Christian ritual and cult, feeling and faith, rather than the original meanings of Jesus in what he said and did. When we seek to reset ourselves in the actual situation between Jesus and his disciples on this occasion, it is hard to conceive of Jesus' mysterious words and acts in these two texts as having any clear meaning for this simple Galilean group. Furthermore, it is just as difficult to relate them to the general body of all that we know of Jesus' own religious message and mission.

The Lukan A text, with all of its ritualistic shortcomings, impresses us as the most genuine, as nearest what Jesus said and did and meant. His utterances and acts in this text are as clear and intelligible as any words and deeds of his associated with the kingdom and its coming. They maintain the point of view of the imminent kingdom, the religious outlook that commands Jesus from the first to the last. His statements are straightforward utterances devoid of all symbolical, ritualistic and sacrificial mystery. He relates the Passover, as he did Solomon and Jonah and the temple (Matt. 12:6, 41–42), to the *greater thing* that will supersede the holiest of houses and festivals. In spite of our natural Christian point of view, we must conceive of this last act in the most Jewish terms possible, for Jesus and his group were not Western Christian believers but pious Galilean Jews celebrating the most sacred of Jewish festivals.

Whatever Jesus may have meant by his act and utterances on this last occasion with the twelve, certainly the original meaning both for himself and his Galilean group was more informal and personal, less theological and ritualistic, than the Christian cult of the Lord's Supper from Paul down would lead us to suppose. This cult bases itself, in theory at least, on what Jesus said and did in a particular instance, yet it is doubtful if the church ever celebrated this rite in the original simpler sense of Jesus. The Christian cult has always centered on the person of Christ, his atoning and sacrificial death. The original act and words of Jesus centered on the kingdom of God and its coming, striking a bond of fellowship, a community of conviction with those who hope and pray for its coming. Perhaps in the earliest years, in the most primitive stages of the Christian brotherhood, the celebration was less formal and impersonal, a fellowship of faith as seems to appear in certain passages of Acts. (Acts 2:42–46; 20:7; 27:35.) But this simpler sense, if it ever existed after Jesus' death and the rise of the Easter faith, was suppressed by 50 A.D., at least within the Pauline communities, by a full-grown Christian cult and ritualistic celebration. Even in our earliest written witness (I Cor. 11:23b–26) the original religious act of Jesus, one of the finest and most impressive of them all, is gone forever. The spontaneous gesture and impromptu utterance of a living and believing personality is converted into an official sacrament of salvation. Cold cult has chilled the warm pulse from which it came. Ceremony may fix the forms and theology may dictate the interpretations, but the original free spirit of the religious genius with whom it originated has escaped its traditional ecclesiastical observance.

6. *THE DESIGNATION OF THE BETRAYER.*

Luke 22:21–23.

In Matthew and Mark the designation of the betrayer preceded the extension of the bread and the wine; in Luke it follows. The account of Luke is much briefer and shows no dependence on Mark. In the second Gospel we met a double designation of the betrayer (Mark 14:18, 20); Luke has just a single statement (22:21) that parallels Mark's first (14:18). Luke does not note the distress of the disciples (Mark 14:19; Matt. 26:22); they do not question Jesus one by one, but question among themselves (Luke 22:23). Luke agrees with Mark that Jesus' word is perfectly general; Judas is not unmasked as he is in Matthew and John. Luke's woe on the betrayer is briefer, less dreadful, and he thinks of the betrayal in terms of the divine determination rather than in terms of the fulfilment of Scripture (Matthew and Mark).

7. *A CONTENTION CONCERNING RANK.*

Luke 22:24.

Luke now proceeds to add a series of farewell words at the table. Mark and Matthew have parallels to approximately half of this matter but they report it in other and earlier connections.

This series is introduced by a contention among the twelve as to who is the greatest. One has the feeling that Luke 22:24 should follow at once upon verses 15–18; Jesus' exalted words on the kingdom and its coming stir the ambitions of the twelve. Verses 19–23 break this natural psychological association and are doubtless an insert. After Jesus has just said that one of them would betray him (21–23), it is difficult to conceive of the twelve disputing over their respective greatness.

Matthew and Mark have no contention among the twelve at the table. Mark (9:33–34) and Luke (9:46) reported a similar contention [2] toward the very close of their Galilean accounts. Luke's dispute at the table is not at all complimentary to the twelve, for here on the very last night with disaster so close upon their Master they quarrel over their respective greatness. Luke's picture here is historical with regard to the attitude of the twelve: namely — they seem to have come up to these last hours with no apprehension of disaster; the awful truth came out of the events themselves — the arrest, trial and death of their Master.

8. *SERVICE AS THE TEST OF GREATNESS.*

Luke 22:25–27.

This is the first of Luke's series of farewell words at the supper table. It comes as Jesus' response to the contention of the twelve concerning greatness. In Matthew

---

[2] Cf. Matt. 18:1.

(20:25–28) and Mark (10:42–48) this word (in another form) is not associated with the supper scene nor with the contention concerning greatness. (Matt. 18:1; Mark 9:33–34.) It is a part of their accounts of the journey to Jerusalem. Both report it in connection with the request of James and John (Matt. 20:20–24; Mark 10:35–41) for advance reservations on Jesus' right and left hand in the kingdom — an incident omitted by Luke.

9. *THRONES FOR THE TWELVE.*

Luke 22:28–30.

The first of Luke's farewell words taught humility and service in view of the coming kingdom, a sort of damper for feelings that run too high. But this promise by its very character would fire these feelings again — the twelve shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Mark has no parallel utterance of Jesus. Matthew, however, has an exact parallel but he does not associate it with the supper scene. He inserts it (19:28) into the midst of Jesus' words on renunciation and its rewards as a part of his account of the journey to Jerusalem.[3]

Luke's form opens with one of the few appreciative words of Jesus. The twelve are not just his followers (Matthew). They are faithful followers, and their loyalty will be rewarded. Thus a more friendly light comes to fall on the twelve after their contention concerning greatness. So often in the Gospels the twelve are pictured as dull, misunderstanding, weak and lacking in courage.

---

[3] Cf. Matt. 19:27–30; Mark 10:28–31; Luke 18:28–30.

10. *SPECIAL SUPPLICATION FOR SIMON.*

Luke 22:31–32.

The first two of Luke's farewell words were addressed to the group, but this word and the following are addressed to the most prominent member of the group, Simon Peter. This passage belongs to the prayer-life of Jesus.[4] The prayer itself we do not have, only its substance. The passage is really a doublet to the one that follows (22:33–34), the familiar forecast of Simon's denial. The two have the same undeniable point, and they may be two different and independent traditions of Jesus' forecast to Simon.

11. *PETER'S PLEDGE — HIS DENIAL FORETOLD.*

Luke 22:33–34.

We meet here the traditional prediction of Simon's denial. It is framed, apparently in its details, in the light of the denial itself. Luke includes this prediction as a part of the supper scene; it is made at the table. The Fourth Evangelist (13:32, 36–38) follows this lead of Luke. But in Matthew and Mark this prediction comes after the supper scene is over when Jesus and his group are on the way to Gethsemane.

---

[4] Cf. Bundy, *The Religion of Jesus*, p. 195 ff; *Our Recovery of Jesus*, p. 313 f.

In Luke Simon's pledge grows out of Jesus' forecast of the failure of his faith. (22:31–32.) In Matthew and Mark it grows out of Jesus' word to the twelve about their being offended in him. The Fourth Gospel has still a different occasion. (13:32.) It grows out of Jesus' veiled allusion to his approaching death. In the Fourth Gospel, too, Jesus predicts not only Simon's denial but also his martyrdom. (13:36; 21:18–19.)

12. *PURSE AND SWORD.*

Luke 22:35–38.

The first two of the farewell words in Luke's table scene were addressed to the twelve as a group (22:25–30); the next two utterances were for Simon in particular (31–34). This final word turns to the group again. It is found only in the third Gospel.

The passage as a whole is puzzling. The purse and the sword here are not to be taken literally. They are simply figures of preparedness. They say that the time of testing is at hand for all concerned. Jesus cannot be thinking of armed resistance for his personal protection, for in the very next scene he halts and rebukes his would-be defender. (22:49–51.)

13. *ON THE WAY TO GETHSEMANE.*

Matthew 26:30–32. *Mark* 14:26–28. *Luke* 22:39.

The supper scene is over. It comes to an end in Matthew and Mark with a hymn, apparently the second half of the *Hallel* (Psalms 115–118) which came toward the close of the celebration of the Passover meal. This is doubtless the clearest echo of the Passover celebration that remains in the Matthew-Markan account of the table scene. Luke omits the hymn. In all three Jesus and his disciples leave the table and resort to the Mount of Olives. Luke has no words or incidents on the way, but in Matthew and Mark the materials in this passage and the following have their scene on the way to Gethsemane.

According to the first two Gospels Jesus now predicts the desertion of all the disciples, which comes at the close of the Gethsemane scene. Luke omits this prediction of the desertion of the twelve as he does the notice of their flight from the scene of the arrest. Throughout his Gospel Luke is inclined to relieve the twelve of any embarrassing details.

The passage closes in Matthew and Mark with an Easter prophecy. It seems out of place here, for it disturbs the natural connection between Jesus' word on the desertion of the disciples and Peter's personal pledge which grows out of it in the following passage of Matthew and Mark. The motive for its insertion at this point is perhaps to explain that the flight of the disciples on the last night was only temporary. A little later they are welded into a compact company by the Easter conviction.

14. *PETER'S PLEDGE — HIS DENIAL FORETOLD.*

Matthew 26:33–35. *Mark* 14:29–31.

In Luke this prediction was made at the table (22:33–34) and it grew out of Jesus' special word to Simon about the impending failure of his faith (31–32). In Matthew and Mark, however, it comes on the way to Gethsemane and is occasioned by Jesus' prediction of the desertion of the twelve. In Mark the cock is to crow twice, and does in the denial story itself (14:72), in Matthew and Luke only once. In the first two Gospels Peter repeats his pledge and the rest of the disciples make a similar vow. Luke omits these elements; only Peter is involved and in a single vow. The Fourth Gospel agrees with Luke in this respect. (13:36–38.)

CHAPTER VII

GOOD FRIDAY

Scene II

Gethsemane

GOOD FRIDAY

Scene II. Gethsemane[a]

	Matthew	Mark	Luke	
1 Jesus' Personal Struggle	26:36–46	14:32–42	22:40–46	
2 The Arrest[b]	47–50	43–46	47–48	*Lk 22:54a*
3 The Resistance[c]	51–54	47	49–51a	
4 The Healing of the Severed Ear	....	....	51b	
5 Jesus' Remonstrance[d]	55–56a	48–49	52–53	
6 The Desertion of the Disciples[e]	56b	50	....	
7 The Flight of a Certain Young Man	....	51–52	....	

[a] John 18:1–11.
[b] John 18:1–8a, 12.
[c] John 18:10–11, 26.
[d] John 18:19–21.
[e] John 18:8b–9.

WE now come to the second of the five scenes in the last twenty-four hours. In all four Gospels this retreat follows at once upon the supper scene. Matthew (26:36) and Mark (14:32) alone use the name "Gethsemane." Luke (22:40) writes "the place" without the name as though it were secret. This secrecy fits in with his Acts conception of the services of Judas, "who was a guide to them that took Jesus" (1:16), as though Judas betrayed the locality of nightly retreat. In the Fourth Gospel the name "Gethsemane" is not used. Jesus crosses the brook Kidron and enters a "garden." (18:1.) Judas knew the place, for Jesus ofttimes resorted thither with his disciples. (18:2.)

Matthew reports the Gethsemane scene substantially as Mark does. He adds no important new elements and omits only Mark's closing notice (14:51–52) concerning the flight of the unnamed young man. Luke agrees with Matthew in omitting this notice; he also omits the notice of the desertion of the disciples (Mark 14:50). Luke adds the new feature of the healing of the severed ear. Within the scene Luke shows no real dependence on Mark and seems to be following a tradition all his own and, at important points, quite different from Mark's.

In the Fourth Gospel (18:1–11) the Gethsemane scene is greatly abbreviated and altered. The most important item in the whole scene, Jesus' struggle in prayer, is gone, and the garden becomes merely the scene of Jesus' arrest. Thus the scene loses the dramatic quality that it has in the first three Gospels and it has nothing of the importance for Jesus personally that they ascribe to it. So far as the Fourth Gospel has parallels to other elements in the scene they are given the peculiar treatment that conforms to the Fourth Evangelist's general delineation of the personality and character of Jesus.

1. *JESUS' PERSONAL STRUGGLE.*

Matthew 26:36–46. *Mark* 14:32–42. *Luke* 22:40–46.

The heart of the Gethsemane scene, omitted by the Fourth Evangelist who has no retreats for prayer and who strips all struggle from the soul of Jesus, is the opening incident in the first three Gospels — Jesus' personal struggle in prayer to God. The Fourth Evangelist seems to have omitted this struggle because such deep distress and humiliation conflicted with his exalted conception of the Christ. He preserves only two ragged remnants in 12:27 and 18:11b. This dramatic soul-conflict has so impressed the Christian imagination that the other items in the scene have been quite overlooked. Among the New Testament writers none seems to have been more deeply impressed with this prayer-scene than the unknown author of Hebrews. (5:7–8.)

Matthew and Mark give practically the same account of the Gethsemane struggle. There are only a few minor differences. The chief differences are found in Luke over against Matthew and Mark. Luke's account is much briefer and there are important changes and new features. Luke has the same admonition at the beginning (22:40) and at the conclusion (46), "Pray that ye enter not into temptation." In Matthew and Mark it appears but once, on Jesus' return from the first retreat. It has a natural point only when it is addressed to disciples who have been asleep. Luke omits the turbulent state of Jesus' emotions. (Matt. 26:37b–38; Mark 14:33b–34.) The most outstanding new feature in Luke's account is that he has Jesus retreat for prayer only one time over against the three retreats in Matthew and Mark. Further, Luke has Jesus withdraw directly from the disciples as a group. He does not select Peter, James and John and withdraw first with them as he does in Matthew and Mark. In the first two Gospels he selects these three intimates and withdraws from the rest of the group, then he withdraws from the three to pray alone. Luke also adds matter not found in the first two Gospels: the appearance of the angel and the sweat as drops of blood. These two features (Luke 22:43–44) are later and legendary; further, they are not found in the best manuscripts of the third Gospel.

In the first two Gospels there is a rebuke in Jesus' words to the disciples who have not watched but slept, and Simon is singled out in particular. In Luke all the disciples have been sleeping; Simon is not singled out for rebuke. Luke excuses all the disciples on the ground that they were overcome with sorrow as though they understood all that was involved and about to come. But the picture of the disciples in Gethsemane does not suggest that they realized the critical character of the situation. In spite of the many things that the Gospel writers have inserted to prepare them for the great tragedy, it nevertheless seems to strike them wholly unsuspecting and unprepared.

The same thing is true of the picture of Jesus in Gethsemane. The Gospel writers have taken pains to assure their readers that Jesus is fully aware of the tragic outcome, yet here they picture him in direst distress of soul. Whatever Jesus' thought on the outcome may have been up to this time, it is only now that the full weight of the issue strikes him to his knees. If he has felt that the divine will points toward death, he has regarded it as tentative and even now open to revision.

The Gethsemane struggle is not only one of the greatest scenes in the life of Jesus but in all religious history. No matter what one's religious faith may be, he cannot but be deeply impressed with such a man on his knees, struggling with his God, with such a prayer on his lips. Gethsemane belongs to humanity's great prayer-scenes, to man's religious triumphs.

This is the last and greatest of all the nine retreats for prayer in the first three Gospels. It is the only one of the nine in which Jesus' prayer is reported.[1] In such a scene we see prayer in its primitive purity and power, something too of what prayer meant in the experience of Jesus. It is the pressure of impending events that brings him to his knees on this occasion. The results of his praying are equally clear. The scene opens with Jesus torn by the strongest of elemental emotions; it closes with him calm, confident and assured. In the trying scenes that follow we see him wholly composed; he exhibits a remarkable degree of self-possession; surrounded by religious fanaticism, he retains a superb fineness of spirit.

2. *THE ARREST.*

Matthew 26:47–50. *Mark* 14:43–46. *Luke* 22:47–48.

In all of the first three Gospels the Gethsemane retreat is interrupted by the appearance of a "multitude." They are emissaries of the Jewish authorities according to Matthew and Mark. Luke does not indicate the constituency of the crowd at this point, but in 22:52 he seems to assume that the authorities themselves are present — a rather improbable detail. According to Matthew and Mark Jesus is seized at once, but in Luke the actual notice of arrest comes only at the very close of the Gethsemane scene (22:54a). In the first three Gospels Jesus comes first into Jewish hands, not Roman hands as in the Fourth Gospel. (18:3, 12.)

At the head of the mob comes Judas. This is his first appearance as an actor in the passion story since his betrayal on Wednesday, that is, in Mark and Luke. In Matthew (26:25) and the Fourth Gospel (13:2, 26–29) he figured personally in the supper scene. We now realize the full import of Judas' betrayal of his Master. Why or what he did to betray him is uncertain, but he did succeed in bringing about his Master's arrest.

---

[1] Cf. Bundy, *The Religion of Jesus*, p. 189 ff; *Our Recovery of Jesus*, p. 314 f.

Matthew and Mark tell of Judas' prearrangement with the multitude: he will identify Jesus with a kiss. Luke omits this prearranged sign. In both Matthew and Mark Judas kisses Jesus, but in Luke Jesus wards off the Judas-kiss. In Mark Jesus is silent; he has no word for the betrayer. In Luke Jesus' word is a rebuke that emphasizes his treachery, " Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss? " (22:48.) In Matthew Jesus' word to Judas is a challenge, " Friend, do that for which thou art come." (26:50a.) In tone it is very like Jesus' word to Judas at the table in the Fourth Gospel, " What thou doest, do quickly." (13:27b.)

The Fourth Gospel has its own peculiar account of the arrest. (18:1–8a.) In this Gospel Judas is leading a cohort of Roman soldiers, also apparently members of the temple guard,— a combination of the Jewish and Roman authorities. Judas plays otherwise no rôle in the scene of the arrest. The idea of the Judas-kiss does not appear. There is no need for it since Jesus identifies himself twice. (18:5b, 8b). He steps forward to meet the guard. When he first identifies himself as the one they seek, they fall down on the ground. Really, the Fourth Evangelist is saying, they have no power to take him; they are helpless before even his presence; he is in complete command of the situation. In the Fourth Gospel, then, Jesus is not arrested; he voluntarily surrenders himself. This peculiar presentation of the scene is simply a part of the Fourth Evangelist's picture of Jesus, of his own free will, going to his death.

3. *THE RESISTANCE.*

Matthew 26:51–54. *Mark* 14:47. *Luke* 22:49–51*a*.

The preceding passage in Matthew and Mark closed with the notice of Jesus' arrest, and now there follows at once in both the resistance by someone with a sword. In Luke, however, the resistance (22:49–51a) precedes the actual notice of the arrest (54a). Luke tells us that it is the prospect of what may follow that prompts the resistance. (22:49a.)

According to all three Gospels the high priest's servant loses an ear. The surprising thing is that there is no counter-attack or reprisal from the side of the authorities. In Mark Jesus has no word of rebuke for his defender and offers no opposition to the defense. Matthew and Luke have a rebuke of Jesus addressed to his defender. In Luke the rebuke is rather gentle, " Suffer ye them thus far." In Matthew, however, it is sharper and a rather extended utterance. (26:52–54.)

The Fourth Evangelist again has his own special account of this scene. (18:10–11.) He names the unnamed persons in the account of the first three Gospels — a frequent habit of his. Simon Peter is the ardent defender of Jesus. The name of the servant of the high priest is Malchus who has a kinsman who is also in the service of the high priest and who witnessed Peter's act in the garden. (18:26.) In the Fourth Gospel Jesus' rebuke is addressed to Peter, "Put up thy sword into the sheath; the cup which the Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" — the Fourth Gospel's only echo of any of the seven prayers of Jesus in the first three Gospels.

4. *THE HEALING OF THE SEVERED EAR.*

Luke 22:51*b*.

At this point Luke introduces a new element in his Gethsemane scene, one not found in the other Gospels — the healing of the severed ear. In Matthew and Mark there is no such reparation; even the Fourth Gospel passes it by. It is the only concrete case of cure ascribed to Jesus during the Jerusalem days in the first three Gospels. This healing is a local tradition ignored, if known, by the other Gospel writers.

5. *JESUS' REMONSTRANCE.*

Matthew 26:55–56*a*. *Mark* 14:48–49. *Luke* 22:52–53.

One has the feeling that this remonstrance should follow upon the arrest and that the resistance should be followed at once by the flight of the disciples. Jesus' speech here is quiet and dignified. It should follow upon the first appearance of his enemies rather than upon the confusion that the armed resistance must have called forth.

The remonstrance of Jesus begins alike in all of the first three Gospels. They come out against him as against a robber, with improvised armament as though seeking a skulking criminal. They come at night and in secret. Why did they not take him in broad daylight, in public as he taught in the temple? In Matthew and Mark the speech closes with Jesus resigned because all this fulfils Scripture. In Luke, however, there is no resort to Scripture. Jesus' thought is more fatalistic, " This is your hour, and the power of darkness." (22:53b.) This view is more like that of the Christianity represented in the Fourth Gospel in which Jesus' fate is set and sealed by a divinely appointed hour; it hovers over him and holds him inviolable until it actually arrives. (John 2:1; 7:6, 8, 30, 44; 8:20; 13:1.) With this resignation to fate the Gethsemane scene closes in Luke.

In the Fourth Gospel the remonstrance of Jesus does not come in the Gethsemane scene but is addressed to the high priest at the Jewish hearing. (18:19–21.) Its principal point is the same as in the first three Gospels.

6. *THE DESERTION OF THE DISCIPLES.*

Matthew 26:56*b*. *Mark* 14:50.

Luke spares the disciples this embarrassing notice. He prepared the way for its omission when he passed over

Jesus' word to the effect that they all would be offended in him this night and be scattered as sheep without a shepherd, spoken on the way to Gethsemane in Matthew (26:30–32) and Mark (14:26–28). Their desertion is all the more dramatic in view of their pledge of loyalty only a short time before, on the way to the very scene of their flight. (Matt. 26:35b; Mark 14:31b.) Luke also omitted this pledge of the twelve. With this notice of the desertion of the disciples the Gethsemane scene closes in Matthew.

The Fourth Evangelist (18:8b–9) does not omit the flight of the disciples as Luke does, nevertheless he spares them this disgrace. He assures his readers that the disciples were not arrested with Jesus because they escaped (Matthew and Mark), but because Jesus requested that they be allowed to go free. " If therefore ye seek me, let these go their way " — thus fulfilling his word in 17:12. In the Fourth Gospel Jesus is the good shepherd protecting his flock to the very end. This apology of the Fourth Evangelist is a clever stroke, but the historical fact of the disciples' desertion becomes only the more graphic.

This is the last that we hear of the twelve, Jesus' chosen group of Galileans, in the Gospel story. Only Simon Peter appears again, in the next scene where the story of his denial is told. Matthew halts between the Jewish and Roman trials to tell of the fate of Judas. (27:3–10.) The Fourth Gospel reports Peter's denial and adds a wholly new feature, the presence of the unnamed and beloved disciple at the Jewish hearing (18:15–17) and at the cross (19:26–27).

The arrest of Jesus seems not only to have scattered his chosen disciples but also to have shattered all the hopes they had gained and entertained in his following. Whither they fled we are not told, perhaps within a short time to their homes in Galilee. Matthew and Mark in their resurrection reports seem to think only of Galilee as the scene of the Easter experiences of the twelve. In Luke and John (chapter 20) the Easter visions have their scene in and about Jerusalem. At any rate, it is only later, in connection with the rise of the Easter faith, that we find Jesus' chosen group assembled again, welded into a compact company by the heat of the new conviction.

7. *THE FLIGHT OF A CERTAIN YOUNG MAN.* *Mark* 14:51–52.

With this strange notice Mark concludes his Gethsemane scene. Who is this young man? What is he doing here and why does he flee in such haste if he does not belong to the intimate following of Jesus? Apparently he is not one of the twelve, for they fled in the preceding passage. Almost endless speculation has gathered about this unnamed figure. The fact that so little is known about him has enabled speculators to say so much about him. Some see in him none other than John Mark, the author of the second Gospel. Here in a dark corner of his portrait he writes his name in cipher. It was in the home of his mother in Jerusalem (Acts 12:12) that Jesus and his disciples ate the Passover, and now the youthful Mark has followed Jesus and his group to Gethsemane. Thus Mark is made an eye-witness of the Jerusalem events in whole or in part. This older view is no longer impressive. There is nothing in the account of the Jerusalem days that would suggest an eye-witness of the events. Rather the whole appears as common community tradition from which all the marks of individual and personal memory have been effaced.

The passage is doubtless a later addition to the Gospel of Mark. The very fact that Matthew and Luke ignore it would suggest that it was not found in the Gospel of Mark known to them.

CHAPTER VIII

GOOD FRIDAY

Scene III

The Jewish Trial

GOOD FRIDAY

Scene III. The Jewish Trial[a]

		Matthew	Mark	Luke	
1	The Delivery to the High Priest[b]	26:57–58	14:53–54	22:54–55	
2	The Jewish Trial *at Night*[c]	59–66	55–64		*Lk 22:67–71*
3	Jesus Mocked *after* the Jewish Trial[d]	67–68	65		*Lk 22:63–65*
4	Peter's Denial[e]	69–75	66–72	56–62	
5	Jesus Mocked *before* the Jewish Trial[d]			63–65	*Mt 26:67–68 Mk 14:65*
6	The Jewish Trial *at Dawn*[c]			66–71	*Mt 26:63–66 Mk 14:61–64*
7	The Delivery to Pilate[f]	27:1–2	15:1	23:1	
8	The Remorse and Suicide of Judas	3–10			*Acts 1:16–20*

[a] John 18:12–28.
[b] John 18:12–14, 24.
[c] John 18:19–21; 19:7.
[d] John 18:22–24.
[e] John 18:15–18, 25–27.
[f] John 18:28.

IN this scene and the following we come to the trial of Jesus. The first hearing is before the Jewish authorities, the Sanhedrin; the second before the Roman governor Pilate. The crux of both trials is the messianic issue. The first three Gospels represent Jesus as condemned to death by the Jewish legal body for the religious offense of blasphemy: he confesses that he is the Messiah. Before Pilate this messianic issue, according to the Gospel writers, is given a political turn by the Jewish accusers, as though Jesus as Messiah were dangerous to the Roman rule.

All sorts of difficulties arise out of the Gospel accounts of this double trial of Jesus. We know that the Jews of Jesus' day enjoyed unusual privileges among the provincials under Roman rule and occupation. That the Jewish legal body could not carry out the death penalty is clear outside of the New Testament in Jewish sources. The Gospels assume that the Jewish court could pass a death sentence, but the Jewish sources furnish no confirmation of this point; rather they contradict it. We know so little of Roman legal procedure and regulations in Palestine in the first century, so little of the rights granted and the restrictions imposed upon the Jewish legal body, that we are not in a position to form a clear conception of what probably happened. The general gist of the trials in the Gospels, the case as preserved against Jesus, is perhaps historical. But in details and particulars we strike upon matters that seem highly improbable, even contradictory.[1]

One has the impression all the way through of the inadequacy of the Gospel accounts of the Jewish and Roman proceedings. So much is missing that we are in need of knowing. So much is reported that seems irregular, illegal, improbable — the arrest on the first night of the feast, the trial at night and on the feast night itself (Matthew and Mark), the assembly of a legal body of seventy-three members or its quorum of twenty-three, the scene at the high priest's house, the death sentence by the Jewish authorities, the pressing of the execution of the death sentence before the Romans and the execution itself on the holiest of feast days.

. . . . .

The Jewish trial begins and ends alike in all of the first three Gospels. It opens with the delivery to the high priest and closes with the delivery to Pilate. Matthew follows Mark exactly in the order of the intervening incidents: the delivery, the trial, the mocking, the denial. Luke reverses this order: the delivery, the denial, the mocking, the trial. Luke's arrangement of the incidents in the Jewish trial is more logical than that of Matthew and Mark for the following reasons:

---

[1] For a sympathetic Jewish statement of the improbabilities, irregularities and illegalities involved in the Gospel accounts of the trial of Jesus, *see* Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels,* I 351–353. Also, Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth,* pp. 340 f.

First. In Matthew and Mark the Jewish trial comes at night. There is the difficulty of getting the Sanhedrin of seventy-three members together on such short notice. There is the more serious question of the legality of a trial at night. Luke's trial at dawn is more probable in this one respect yet it falls upon the greatest of the Jewish feast days.

Second. According to Matthew and Mark there are really two sittings of the Sanhedrin, one for the trial at night (Matt. 26:59–66; Mark 14:55–64) and one early in the morning when Jesus is sent to Pilate (Matt. 27:1–2; Mark 15:1). Luke's account is more natural at this point, for there is but one session of the Sanhedrin, at dawn, at which Jesus is tried (22:66–71) and delivered to Pilate (23:1).

Third. Mark's account of the trial has an unnatural break in it; the same is true of Matthew. In Mark we should expect the story of Simon's denial to follow at once upon the delivery to the high priest. The scene is all set for it in Mark 14:54:

> " And Peter had followed him afar off, even within, into the court of the high priest; and he was sitting with the officers, and warming himself in the light *of the fire.*" (Cf. Matt. 26:58.)

However, the story of Simon's denial does not come at this natural point but later (14:66–72), the trial (55–64) and the mocking (65) intervening. Consequently, Mark (and Matthew in 26:29) must reset the scene for Simon's denial in 14:66–67. In Luke, however, this unnatural break does not exist, for the denial of Simon (22:56–62) follows at once upon the delivery to the high priest when the scene is all set (54b–55).

Before turning to the particular paragraphs on the Jewish trial in the first three Gospels, we must make a note or two on the Fourth Gospel's account of the Jewish hearing. It extends from 18:12–28. All semblance of formal procedure is gone. The messianic issue, the very crux of the Jewish trial in the first three Gospels, does not appear. Jesus is not condemned to death for blasphemy as he is in the first three Gospels. To interrogate Jesus on the question of his messiahship in the Fourth Gospel would be an empty formality, for from the very first in this Gospel Jesus has claimed to be the Messiah before both friends and foes. Instead the high priest simply conducts a superficial investigation concerning Jesus' following and teaching. (18:19–21.) There is no mocking of Jesus in connection with the Jewish trial in the Fourth Gospel; there is just a blow from an officer for Jesus' curt word to the high priest. (18:22.) The Fourth Evangelist seems to think of the trial at night as the first two Gospels report it. (18:28b.) The whole account of the Jewish trial in the Fourth Gospel is in utter confusion.

1. *THE DELIVERY TO THE HIGH PRIEST.*

Matthew 26:57–58. *Mark* 14:53–54. *Luke* 22:54–55.

Mark does not give us the name of the high priest at any point in his Gospel; Luke at no point in his account of the trial. (Cf. Luke 3:2.) Matthew names Caiaphas, in office 18–36 A.D. according to Josephus, as he did in the conspiracy back in 26:3 on Wednesday of the passion week. The Fourth Gospel has Jesus delivered to Annas, in office 7–14 A.D., although Caiaphas is high priest (18:13); only at the end of the Jewish hearing does Annas send Jesus to Caiaphas (18:24). Annas and Caiaphas are named together in Acts 4:6.

In Matthew the Sanhedrin is already assembled when Jesus is brought as though the whole affair, arrest and trial, had been carefully prearranged. In Mark they assemble immediately. Luke (22:66) has the more probable account with the assembly early in the morning.

At this point all of the first three Gospels introduce Peter, following afar off. This breaks the thread of the narrative which should move from the delivery to the trial. The scene is all set for the denial which follows at once in Luke, but in Matthew and Mark the trial and the mocking intervene. In the first three Gospels Peter is the only disciple whose presence is noted in the court, but in the Fourth Gospel there is " another disciple," the unnamed and beloved, who is present and through whose influence (he is known to the high priest) Peter gains entrance to the court. (18:15–16.)

2. *THE JEWISH TRIAL AT NIGHT.*

Matthew 26:59–66. *Mark* 14:55–64.

The question of the legality of a trial at night has already been mentioned. In Matthew and Mark the Jewish hearing goes through two stages — a sort of preliminary stage introducing false witnesses and alleged statements of Jesus against the temple; then comes the real issue, the messianic question. Matthew varies from Mark only in minor details.

To all of the preliminary charges Jesus remains silent, even though his silence might be interpreted as an admission of the truth of the things brought against him. For Christians generally the silence of Jesus in both trials has been one of the most impressive features. The Gospel writers were impressed with it, and certain Old Testament passages (Isa. 53:7; Ps. 38:12–14) may have occurred to them. Even the high priest and Pilate are deeply impressed.

The heart of the Jewish hearing, the only part that Luke reports, is the messianic issue. The high priest puts to Jesus the question, " Art thou the Christ, the son of the Blessed? " What is it that prompts the high priest to put this question? It has not grown out of the preliminary stages of the hearing. How has this hint come to the authorities' ears? Did Judas inform them that Jesus regarded himself as the Messiah, or that his intimate followers regarded him as such? The Gospel writers give us no answer to these questions.

For the first time now before the high priest Jesus speaks. His reply in Mark 14:62, " I am . . ." is puzzling. It seems to be an open affirmative. As such it stands wholly isolated in Mark's story. On every other occasion in Mark Jesus' replies to messianic suggestions and confessions have been non-committal. Never once, in public or in private, has Jesus given a flat " Yes " or " No " to the messianic question. In the light of his habitual reticence this one affirmative is unintelligible, especially when it seems to cost him his life. Why now, of all times, such positiveness when on other occasions he was satisfied not to commit himself?

One cannot help but be skeptical of this single affirmative in Mark. Matthew (26:64) and Luke (22:67, 70) have Jesus give an evasive reply: " Thou hast said " (Matthew); " Ye say that I am " (Luke). This evasion fits in with Jesus' usual non-committal attitude. Further, the second part of Jesus' reply in Mark, following the " I am," is a strongly adversative statement: " and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven." In this conclusion Jesus is speaking, not of himself but of Another and in the light of it Mark's " I am " seems to break down. Jesus' reply to the high priest then becomes a final declaration of the faith that has held him from the first — the Son of man will come. (Matt. 10:23; Mark 9:1; 13:26.) Thus this statement relates itself in an organic way to other utterances of Jesus.

Whatever Jesus may have meant by his reply, the high priest in Matthew and Mark interprets it as blasphemy. In all of the first three Gospels his reply is regarded as an affirmative. In Matthew and Mark the high priest rends his garments as prescribed that he should do when blasphemy was spoken in his presence. (Lev. 10:6; 21:10.)

In Matthew and Mark the Jewish hearing closes with the notice that all condemned him to be worthy of death. Both seem to be thinking of a formal verdict and death sentence. We should expect the delivery to Pilate to follow at once, as it does in Luke, but in the first two Gospels the Jewish proceedings come during the night and the delivery to Pilate requires a second session, in the morning. (Matt. 27:1–2; Mark 15:1.)

3. *JESUS MOCKED AFTER THE JEWISH TRIAL.*

Matthew 26:67–68. *Mark* 14:65.

After the Jewish trial the night is taken up in Matthew and Mark with the mocking of Jesus and the story of Simon's denial. All of the first three Gospels agree that the mocking comes during the night. In Matthew and Mark it follows at once upon the Jewish trial; in Luke it immediately precedes it. The whole scene is an anticipation of the mocking by the Roman soldiers with which the Roman trial ends in the first two Gospels. We noted that the Fourth Gospel has no mocking in connection with the

Jewish trial, just a blow from an officer during the hearing. (18:22–23.)

4. *PETER'S DENIAL.*

Matthew 26:69–75. *Mark* 14:66–72. *Luke* 22:56–62.

Now comes the denial of Peter in all of the first three Gospels. The scene was set once before in connection with the delivery to the high priest. (Matt. 26:58; Mark 14:54; Luke 22:54b–56.) But in Matthew and Mark the Jewish trial and the mocking have intervened and the scene must be reset. In Luke this interruption does not take place and the denial (22:56–62) follows at once upon the delivery to the high priest and Peter's introduction into the scene (54–55). In all three Gospels, however, Simon's denial comes during the night and is associated with the Jewish trial.

The details are much the same in the first three Gospels. Matthew and Luke have only one cock-crow, as Jesus predicted. (Matt. 26:34; Luke 22:34.) In Mark the cock crows twice, as Jesus foretold. (14:30.) The first cock-crow comes after the first denial; the second after the third denial, as does the only one in Matthew and Luke. The two crowings in Mark increase the dramatic effect: even after a first warning, Simon goes ahead to deny his Master two more times. Luke omits Peter's cursing in connection with the third denial, but he adds a wholly new feature —Jesus himself witnesses his disciple's denials, thus increasing Peter's utter humiliation. (22:61a.) In

Matthew and Luke Peter leaves the place; in all three he weeps.

The account of Peter's denial is split in the Fourth Gospel. The first denial (18:16–17) precedes the Jewish hearing; the second and third follow it (18:25–27). The Fourth Gospel agrees with Matthew and Luke in having but one cock-crow. The Fourth Gospel omits Peter's cursing as Luke did, also the notice of his leaving the scene and his weeping.

The denial of Peter is one of the most dramatic scenes in the Gospel story. In view of this disciple's prominent place in Jesus' company, his recent pledge of loyalty and his subsequent distinction, the account is very human and impressive. If the Gospel accounts go back in substance to Simon's own story, we shall have to say that he did not spare himself. With this scene Peter disappears from the Gospel story.

5. *JESUS MOCKED BEFORE THE JEWISH TRIAL.*

Luke 22:63–65.

In Luke the mocking follows the denial of Peter and precedes the Jewish trial; in Matthew and Mark we found exactly the reverse arrangement — trial, mocking, denial. In Luke Jesus is abused by the guards who hold him, not by the Jewish dignitaries as in Matthew and Mark; in Luke Jesus is not yet before them. The abuse in Luke does not express bitter feeling, as in the first two Gospels, but seems to be simply a means of passing the night until the Jewish legal body assembles at dawn.

6. *THE JEWISH TRIAL AT DAWN.*

Luke 22:66–71.

Luke's trial at dawn has probability in its favor over against the trial at night in Matthew and Mark. Luke's account is much briefer due to his omission of the preliminary stages — the false witnesses and the alleged word against the temple in Matthew (26:59–61) and Mark (14:55–59). He also omits the special feature of Jesus' silence and its impression on the high priest. (Matt. 26:62; Mark 14:60.) The high priest does not question Jesus in Luke, but the Sanhedrin, "they." The hearing goes directly to the messianic issue, "If thou art the Christ, tell us." Jesus' reply is not an answer, "If I tell you, ye will not believe; and if I ask you, ye will not answer." (22:67–68.) In Luke "they" put a second question to Jesus, not found in Matthew and Mark, "Art thou then the Son of God?" Jesus' reply is again non-committal, "Ye say that I am." (22:70.) Thus Matthew and Luke agree together against Mark's affirmative answer; in both Jesus evades; as usual, he does not commit himself. Luke omits the closing features in Matthew and Mark — the idea of blasphemy, the rending of the garments and the formal death sentence. In Luke the Jewish case against Jesus is not clear. "We have heard from his own mouth" has no object.

7. *THE DELIVERY TO PILATE.*

Matthew 27:1–2. *Mark* 15:1. *Luke* 23:1.

This is the closing scene of the Jewish trial in all three Gospels. This is the second assembly of the Sanhedrin in Matthew and Mark, the first coming during the night when Jesus was tried and condemned. Just how the morning session is related to the previous assembly during the night is not clear. Luke, however, has just the one session, at dawn, and the delivery to Pilate (23:1) is simply its conclusion (22:66–71). Thus in Luke the Jewish and the Roman trials come immediately together in the early morning. There is a natural promptness in the whole proceeding in Luke that does not appear in Matthew and Mark with the trial during the night, a re-assembly of the Sanhedrin in the morning and then the Roman trial. This morning session must have been early and the Roman trial brief, for Jesus is crucified at 9:00 A.M. The exact locality of the trial before Pilate is not mentioned in the first three Gospels. In the Fourth Gospel Jesus is led from Caiaphas into the Praetorium. (18:28.)

. . . . .

Looking back over the Jewish trial as a whole, we may call it at best a hearing or investigation. Matthew and Mark attempt to introduce features that would suggest formal legal procedure — the necessity for two witnesses, corroborating testimony, the offense of blasphemy and the high priest rending his garments. That a formal death sentence was not passed is clear in the Roman trial where the Jewish authorities appear before Pilate, not with a death sentence for ratification but with accusations and denunciations against Jesus, insisting on judgment against him.

We cannot state definitely what happened before the Sanhedrin. The Gospel reports do not in any respect resemble court records. They seem to give simply the common Christian tradition of what happened, the tradition in circulation a generation after the event itself. Certainly the account is presented from the Christian angle alone. Some of the details suggest later Christian bitterness rather than historical probabilities. The Jewish court is presented as both prosecutor and judge. It is surprising that the cleansing of the temple does not figure in the proceedings since it seems to have been the principal source of the opposition that led to Jesus' death. If the entry on Palm Sunday had been generally regarded as messianic, it certainly would have been introduced, for the Jewish case seems to center on the messianic issue. The Gospels leave full responsibility upon the Jews. They condemned an innocent man to death for what the early Christians held him to be — the Messiah of God.

8. *THE REMORSE AND SUICIDE OF JUDAS.*

Matthew 27:3–10.

In Mark and Luke and John we hear no more of Judas after his appearance at the scene of the arrest, in Gethsemane. Matthew, however, halts at this point and gives us the story of his terrible end. Matthew inserts it here at about the only available point, between the Jewish and the Roman trials. Still it interrupts the natural progress of the narrative. By inserting the story just after the Jewish proceedings Matthew casts a reflection on Jewish justice and enhances Jewish guilt. Judas repents his act; the chief priests and elders do not repent theirs. The promptness with which Judas takes his life would suggest that Matthew thinks of him as a witness of the Jewish trial.

Matthew is the only Gospel writer who tells of the fate of Judas. Within the New Testament there is only one other account of the betrayer's bitter end. It comes in a parenthetical passage in the midst of Peter's speech in connection with the choice of a disciple to take Judas' place. (Acts 1:18–19.) The Acts account is much briefer and represents a wholly different strain of tradition concerning the betrayer's fate. About the only things the two accounts have in common are the assumptions that Judas met a prompt death and that the money he received was used to buy a field. Matthew pictures Judas as repentant and remorseful; the Acts story does not. In Matthew Judas takes his own life; he is a suicide. In Acts, however, his death is accidental, better perhaps, providential; he plunges headlong over a cliff. Thus the Acts account gives the betrayer a more grewsome and terrible end.

There are other accounts of Judas' fate outside of the

New Testament. All of them are without doubt legendary, but they evince a rather lively interest in the fate of the faithless disciple who turned traitor against his Master. Judas never figures in the story of the beginnings and spread of earliest Christianity as do others of the twelve, and the general assumption of the early Christian writings, even when silent, is that Judas is off the scene forever.

CHAPTER IX

GOOD FRIDAY

Scene IV

The Roman Trial

GOOD FRIDAY

Scene IV. The Roman Trial[a]

	Matthew	Mark	Luke		
1 Jesus before Pilate[b]	27:11–14	15:2–5	23:2–3		
2 Pilate Declares Jesus Innocent[c]	....	....	4		
3 The Delivery to Herod[d]	....	....	5–7		
4 Jesus before Herod[e]	....	....	8–12	*Mt 27:28–30*	*Mk 15:17–19*
5 Before Pilate Again — 2d Declaration[f]	....	....	13–16		
6 The Passover Amnesty — Barabbas[g]	15–18	6–10	....	*Lk 23:18b–19*	
7 The Intervention of Pilate's Wife	19	....	....		
8 Request for Barabbas — 3d Declaration[h]	20–23	11–14	18–23a		
9 Pilate Washes His Hands	24–25	....	....		
10 Barabbas Released — Jesus Condemned[i]	26	15	23b–25		
11 Jesus Mocked by the Roman Soldiers[j]	27–31	16–20	....	*Lk 23:11*	

[a] John 18:29–19:16.

[b] John 18:29–32, 33–38a; 19:8–11.

[c] John 18:38b; 19:4, 6b.

[d] John 18:24.

[e] Acts 4:27–28.

[f] John 19:12–14a.

[g] John 18:38b–40.

[h] John 19:4–7, 14–15; Acts 3:13–14.

[i] John 19:1, 16.

[j] John 19:2–3.

MARK'S account of the Roman trial is rather brief. (15:2–20.) Matthew (27:11–31) gives substantially the same account and shows his usual dependence on Mark in these closing scenes. Into the Markan account of the Roman trial Matthew inserts two passages found only in his Gospel — the intervention of Pilate's wife in behalf of Jesus (27:19) and the incident of Pilate washing his hands (27:24–25). In the first two Gospels there is just a single scene in the Roman trial. Once Jesus is in the presence of Pilate he does not leave until he is condemned to death and delivered up for execution. Only Pilate, no other Roman official, figures in the trial of Jesus in Matthew and Mark.

Throughout these last scenes we have seen that Luke goes his own way, giving his own account, quite independent of Mark. The same is true of his account of the Roman trial. (23:2–25.) His principal new feature is that he has Jesus not only before Pilate but before Herod also. The Roman trial in Luke falls into three separate scenes: first, before Pilate who sends Jesus to Herod when he learns that he is a Galilean (23:2–7); second, before Herod who sends Jesus back to Pilate (8–12); third, before Pilate again when Jesus is condemned to death and delivered up for execution (13–25).

The Roman trial in the Fourth Gospel takes on the form of a very elaborate account. It extends from 18:19 to 19:16. The Fourth Evangelist agrees with Matthew and Mark in having Jesus before Pilate only; Herod does not figure. Otherwise, the Fourth Evangelist goes his own way in recounting what is said and done. He has his own peculiar plan in depicting the scene. In the first three Gospels our impression is that Jesus and his Jewish accusers stand together in the presence of Pilate. But in the Fourth Gospel the scene is divided. The Jews stand without the Praetorium making their accusations; they will not enter the Roman court lest they defile themselves and cannot eat the feast. Jesus is not in the presence of his accusers but within the Praetorium. Pilate connects this divided scene by appearing now outside before the Jewish accusers (18:29, 38; 19:5, 13), now with Jesus alone within (18:33; 19:1, 9). Pilate hears the Jewish denunciations without; he interrogates Jesus within the Praetorium. Six separate scenes, public and private, are the result: 18:29–32, 33–38a, 38b–40; 19:1–7, 8–12, 13–16. These numerous shifts of scene along with new details make the Roman trial in the Fourth Gospel more dramatic.

The Fourth Evangelist puts new words on the lips of all concerned — Jesus, Pilate and the Jewish accusers. In the first three Gospels Pilate extracts from Jesus only two meaningless words, "Thou sayest." But in the Fourth Gospel the silence of Jesus falls into the background (19:9b), and a series of words (18:34, 36, 37; 19:11) cross with the questions of Pilate (18:33, 35, 37; 19:10). Before Pilate in private Jesus discourses on his kingdom which is not of this world (18:36), on the mission of truth that brought him into the world (18:37) and the powerlessness of Pilate to harm him except for the divine decree (19:11).

In the Fourth Gospel Pilate puts new and different questions to Jesus apart from the question common to all four Gospels, "Art thou the king of the Jews?" He asks, "What hast thou done?" (18:35.) "Art thou a king then?" (18:37.) Pilate is a proud Roman: "Am I a Jew?" (18:35.) He is a pagan philosopher: "What is truth?" (18:38.) He is a Christian metaphysician: "Whence art thou?" (19:9.)

The scenes between Pilate and the Jews are a continual bandying. Pilate taunts and derides the Jews and their case against Jesus. "Behold, the man!" (19:5.) "Behold, your king!" (19:14.) The title which Pilate composes for the cross is a final derision, not of Jesus but of the Jews, and they resent it as such. (19:19–22.)

The attitude of the Jews toward Pilate is different from their attitude in the first three Gospels. Only once do they hint at their case against Jesus (19:7), and Pilate seeks to learn the trouble from Jesus rather than from his accusers (18:35). The Jewish attitude toward Pilate is rather that he should not inquire into the merits of the case (18:30); the fact that they bring Jesus is enough.

They even dare to intimidate Pilate and threaten to denounce him before the emperor (19:12). They end with a flourish of pro-Roman sentiment and loyalty — " We have no king but Caesar." (19:15.)

. . . . .

The different accounts of the Roman trial in the Gospels result in different pictures of Pilate. Mark's picture seems most probable in which Pilate appears as an indifferent and impartial Roman official. He does not seem to be especially impressed with the Jewish charges; he seems to sense the nature of the whole situation. (15:10.) Yet he does not appear as a champion of Jesus' innocence, nor does he seek to save him. He seems to consent to Jesus' death in order to preserve the civil peace, " wishing to content the multitude " (15:15) — the most precious possession in any Roman province.

In Matthew the picture of Pilate is greatly altered by the introduction of the two new features. Pilate's wife intervenes because Jesus is an innocent man. (27:19.) Pilate publicly washes his hands of the blood of Jesus. (27:24–25.) In Matthew, then, Pilate appears as a weakling. He is convinced of Jesus' innocence yet he lacks the courage or the power to save him.

This picture is painted in still bolder colors in the third Gospel. Luke presents Pilate as the avowed friend of Jesus. Three times he declares Jesus innocent. (23:4, 14, 22.) He seeks to save Jesus' life and proposes to compromise by scourging. (23:16, 22.) Throughout, Luke seeks to relieve Pilate of all responsibility for Jesus' death and load it on to the Jews. Yet he accomplishes this only at the expense of Pilate's character.

The Fourth Evangelist's picture of Pilate, apart from the new features already mentioned, is taken from the third Gospel. Three times, too, the Fourth Evangelist has Pilate declare Jesus innocent (18:38; 19:4, 6), and he seeks to release him (19:12). But Pilate finally allows himself to be intimidated by political threats which he knows express a hypocritical loyalty.

1. *JESUS BEFORE PILATE.*

Matthew 27:11–14. *Mark* 15:2–5. *Luke* 23:2–3.

One has the impression that the materials in this passage of Matthew and Mark should be reversed. The accusations of the chief priests and Jesus' silence (Mark 15:3–5) should precede Pilate's question and Jesus' answer (15:2). This arrangement we find in Luke.

Matthew and Mark tell us that the chief priests charged Jesus with many things; just what things is not stated. To these preliminary charges Jesus makes no reply. Luke, however, elaborates on these charges. (23:2.) They are exclusively political and would put Jesus in the light of a revolutionist dangerous to the Roman rule. He perverts the Jewish people. He forbids payment of tribute to Rome — the exact opposite of what Jesus said in Luke 20:25. He claims to be Christ a king, although his answer was wholly evasive before the Jewish authorities (Luke 22:70).

In all four Gospels Pilate puts the question, "Art thou the king of the Jews?" This question shows that the messianic issue is the crux of the Jewish charges in the Roman trial as well as before the Sanhedrin. It is clear later in the inscription over the cross in all four Gospels. In their own court the Jews interpreted it as blasphemy, a religious offense, but before Pilate they present the messianic issue as a political crime.

In all of the first three Gospels Jesus' reply, "Thou sayest," is his only word before Pilate. Is this an affirmative or a negative? An admission or a denial? The same uncertainty appears here that we met in Jesus' reply to the high priest. It is probably evasive, and we do not know what was in Jesus' mind in uttering it. How Pilate interpreted this enigmatic reply we do not know. If as an affirmative, surely he would have condemned Jesus at once. Yet the fact remains that the Jewish authorities, one way or another, secured the Roman death sentence.

2. *PILATE DECLARES JESUS INNOCENT.*
Luke 23:4.

With this brief passage we come to the first of Luke's two new features in the Roman trial, Pilate's repeated declarations of Jesus' innocence. (23:14, 22.) This theme of Jesus' innocence Luke carries on through the crucifixion scene; the dying thief (23:41), the centurion at the cross (23:47) and Joseph of Arimathea (23:51). This first of the three declarations by Pilate follows at once upon Jesus' " Thou sayest " which Pilate apparently does not regard as an affirmative.

Luke here introduces the multitudes as though the case of Jesus on trial had aroused the whole city. The presence of the general public Luke carries on through to the very end with a climax in a general public demonstration of grief over the fate of Jesus. (23:13, 27, 35, 48.)

3. *THE DELIVERY TO HEROD.*

Luke 23:5–7.

Now we meet Luke's second new feature in the Roman trial — the delivery to Herod. This tradition is wholly peculiar to the third Gospel and its companion work, the book of Acts (4:27–28). The fresh charges here are occasioned by Pilate's first declaration of Jesus' innocence. These charges remain political and the whole of Jesus' activity, in Galilee as well as in Jerusalem, is presented as that of a trouble-making insurrectionist. This is the only instance in which the Galilean activity of Jesus figures in the trials. The Jerusalem enemies of Jesus otherwise seem to be ignorant of his work in the north province, or else they deliberately ignore it. Their issues against him seem to have had an exclusively Jerusalem origin and setting.

Pilate learns for the first time of Jesus' Galilean origin. He sends Jesus to Herod whom only Luke mentions as present in Jerusalem. The purpose of Pilate in this transfer is not clear. Luke seems to regard it as a legal technicality — Jesus is of Herod's jurisdiction — perhaps only an official compliment or nicety. (Luke 23:12.)

The Fourth Gospel has a transfer from one official to another, but it comes in the Jewish trial, not the Roman — Annas to Caiaphas. (18:24.)

4. *JESUS BEFORE HEROD.*

Luke 23:8–12.

This is the second of Luke's three scenes in the Roman trial over against the single scene before Pilate in Matthew and Mark. This scene, according to Luke, fulfils Herod's desire to see Jesus, first expressed back in 9:9 (Luke only). Among the Gospel writers Luke takes the greatest interest in Herod, and in Luke alone does Herod manifest any interest in Jesus. In only one passage does he represent Herod as hostile toward Jesus. (13:31–32.) Among the women in Jesus' following Luke alone mentions one Joanna, the wife of Chuzas, Herod's steward. (8:1–3.) Herod's name does not occur in the Fourth Gospel. In Matthew (14:1) and Mark (6:14) he confuses in a superstitious manner Jesus and John the Baptist.

The one new feature is that Luke has Jesus mocked before Herod. In Matthew and Mark this mocking concludes the Roman trial and comes only when Jesus is condemned and delivered up for execution.

The scene before Herod marks no real progress in the

Roman proceedings. Herod simply sends Jesus back to Pilate, and we are no farther along than we were at the close of the first scene before Pilate. According to Luke, this little deference of Pilate heals a breach between him and his subordinate. Also, it recruits one other witness for Jesus' innocence. (23:15.)

5. *BEFORE PILATE AGAIN — SECOND DECLARATION.*

Luke 23:13–16.

This passage opens Luke's third scene in the Roman trial. Jesus is before Pilate again who reviews the case thus far. He reports the findings of Herod as though the Jewish accusers had not been present at the hearing. (23:10.) Pilate makes his second declaration of Jesus' innocence and interprets Herod's return of Jesus as another official declaration, an inference that the scene before Herod does not make wholly clear.

6. *THE PASSOVER AMNESTY — BARABBAS.*

Matthew 27:15–18. *Mark* 15:6–10.

Luke's elaborate digression from the accounts of Matthew and Mark is over. From this point on Mark's plan governs the course of the proceedings. At this point in Matthew and Mark the Roman trial takes a new turn. Less attention is given the Jewish charges against Jesus, yet his Jewish accusers secure his death sentence through this new turn — the Passover amnesty. Now a multitude comes to the front; the chief priests fall into the background and incite the multitude in order to accomplish their own end. The scene before Pilate loses the character of a legal proceeding with accusers and accused confronting each other. It develops almost into a mob scene, Pilate confronted by a multitude whose feeling runs bitter and strong in making their demands for Barabbas' release and Jesus' death.

The rôle of the general public here in bringing about Jesus' death in Matthew and Mark really contradicts the notices of the popularity that has protected him during the Jerusalem days and the original caution of the chief priests — " not during the feast, lest haply there shall be a tumult of the people." (Mark 14:2.) Or is the multitude here just a crowd of Barabbas' sympathizers who assemble to demand his release and not to witness the trial of Jesus? In Luke the instrumentality of the multitudes in accomplishing the ends of the Jewish authorities does not appear. In the death scene that follows Luke distinguishes, as Matthew and Mark do not, between the public feeling and that of Jesus' enemies. The Fourth Evangelist does not use the multitudes as Matthew and Mark do; he does not distinguish between the people and the authorities as Luke does. In his long account of the Roman trial he mentions the authorities but twice (19:6, 15); elsewhere in the proceedings it is the " Jews " in general who are denouncing Jesus before Pilate and demanding his death.

The custom of releasing a prisoner at the time of the

Passover (the Passover amnesty) is not known in any writings outside of the New Testament. This custom does not appear in Luke's account, although Barabbas is released. The custom may have been purely local and confined to Jerusalem. It may have obtained only temporarily under Pilate's administration. At any rate, Mark and Matthew refer to it as well known; both halt a moment to explain it, for it accounts for what follows.

Matthew and Mark introduce Barabbas in connection with the Passover amnesty, Luke only in connection with the request itself. Matthew speaks of him as "a notable prisoner"; in Mark he lies bound in prison for leading an insurrection in which blood was shed. Luke's identification is the same as that of Mark except that the insurrection took place in the city itself. (23:19.) Just what insurrection or revolt we do not know.

At the close of this passage Matthew and Mark give us their hints as to Pilate's thought and feelings. He sees through the perfidy of the chief priests, shows perhaps a trace of favor toward Jesus, but not strong. Pilate is pictured as "stern, pitiless and cruel" in writings outside of the New Testament.

This scene has its parallel in the Fourth Gospel in 18:39–40. There is no explanation of the Passover amnesty, but it is referred to by Pilate as a custom. Pilate takes the initiative in proposing the release of Jesus, but the Jews suggest Barabbas, who, the Fourth Evangelist explains, was a robber.

7. *THE INTERVENTION OF PILATE'S WIFE.*

Matthew 27:19.

Matthew at this point, between Mark 15:10 and 11, inserts the first of his two new features in the Roman trial —the intervention of Pilate's wife in behalf of Jesus. This is the only piece of New Testament tradition to this effect. In the later apocryphal literature the incident is elaborated and her name is given as Claudia Procula. Still later she became a saint of the Greek and Ethiopian church. Her intervention has no influence on the outcome of the proceedings. Matthew seems interested in her as a Roman witness of Jesus' innocence.

8. *THE REQUEST FOR BARABBAS — THIRD DECLARATION.*

Matthew 27:20–23. *Mark* 15:11–14. *Luke* 23:18–23*a*.

In Luke this scene seems to be between Pilate and the Jewish authorities; the general public as a howling mob does not figure. The Jewish accusers demand the release of Barabbas. Luke at this point completes his picture of Pilate. For the third time he declares Jesus innocent (23:4, 14); for the second time he proposes to chastise and release him (23:16, 22).

In Matthew and Mark we have a mob scene. The Jewish authorities drop back to urge the crowd on. It seems strange that this crowd should lend itself so readily to the ends of the enemies of Jesus. We might naturally suppose that the appearance of the general public would thwart the plans of the authorities. But here the crowd is turned into a mob thirsting for Jesus' blood. Is this change in public sentiment in such a short time conceivable? Or is it just an element in the passion drama of Matthew and Mark? From the dramatic point of view this change from public favor to general public hostility creates no serious problem. Have not the readers of Matthew and Mark been told of Judas' betrayal, of the desertion of the disciples, of Peter's denial? Is it strange, as a part of the story, that the people now turn against him? But the public hostility here is perhaps too bitter, for Jesus becomes almost a victim of popular demand. Why is Barabbas so popular? Was he sentenced for a revolt that had public favor? Or is his popularity just another part of the drama?

Pilate seems unconvinced of Jesus' guilt, " Why, what evil hath he done? " This question hardly fits the situation, for the choice between Jesus and Barabbas presupposes that Jesus too is condemned. Or is Pilate simply heckling the crowd? If so, it is rather foolish in view of the crowd's ugly mood. A fresh outburst of fury answers him. They demand the worst of deaths, a Roman crucifixion, reserved for the worst of criminals. This prepares the way for the death scene.

In the Fourth Gospel there are two such outbursts, demanding death by crucifixion (19:4–7, 14–15), but they come from the Jews who push their case against Jesus, not from the Passover mob as in Matthew and Mark.

9. *PILATE WASHES HIS HANDS.*

Matthew 27:24–25.

At this point Matthew inserts the second of his two new elements in the Roman trial, between Mark 15:14 and 15. Both concern Pilate and his wife. (27:19.) According to Matthew, they are a miserable pair. The one is troubled by evil omens in dreams, the other by a bad conscience. Matthew now pictures Pilate in an act of desperation. He is convinced of Jesus' innocence, but he is helpless. All he can do is to absolve his soul. The probability of a stern Roman official performing such a distinctly Jewish act (Deut. 21:6–7; Ps. 26:6; 73:13) is not very great. This scene comes at the expense of Pilate's character; he is turned into a moral weakling.

10. *BARABBAS RELEASED — JESUS CONDEMNED.*

Matthew 27:26. *Mark* 15:15. *Luke* 23:23*b*–25.

At this point the tension snaps. Jesus is condemned. In Matthew and Mark Pilate yields to the demands of the mob. Mark introduces his only motive for Pilate's condemnation of Jesus: he wishes to content the multitude. Civil peace was more precious than the life of a Galilean Jew. In Luke it is the voices of the Jewish authorities that prevail. Luke emphasizes the shamefulness of the choice — Barabbas for Jesus, as he does in Acts 3:13–14. In Luke we might think that Pilate delivers Jesus up to the Jews for execution. This is still more clearly the meaning of the Fourth Evangelist. (19:16.) This cannot be historical. Luke omits the scourging reported by Matthew and Mark. This was the first step in the Roman execution of a condemned criminal. In the Fourth Gospel the scourging comes not at the close but toward the middle of the proceedings. (19:1.)

11. *JESUS MOCKED BY THE SOLDIERS.*

Matthew 27:27–31. *Mark* 15:16–20.

Luke omits the mocking of Jesus by the soldiers at the close of the Roman trial reported by Matthew and Mark. Luke had Jesus mocked before Herod. (23:11.) In the Fourth Gospel this mocking does not come at the close but in the third of the six scenes. (19:2–3.) In Matthew and Mark there is a shift in scene. Jesus is brought within the Praetorium as though all the proceedings thus far had been before it. Jesus is now out of Jewish hands.

Both Matthew and Mark pass over the scourging with a hasty notice as though it were something horrible, and it was. But both go into great detail in the scene which seems to have included no great violence. The mocking appears more as a rough-and-ready sport of the soldiers. The idea of a simple Galilean as a king may have appealed to them as humorous. In Mark the mockery is mingled with light abuse; in Matthew it turns into rougher abuse at the close.

. . . . .

In reviewing the Roman case and action against Jesus we find that it is not much clearer than the account of the Jewish trial. The account in the Gospels is the commonly known and circulated tradition of the early Christian community. We can be sure of only the principal point: Jesus was tried before Pilate and condemned to death. The details of the proceedings are no longer clear. The various factors that secured Jesus' condemnation are not certain, whether his reply to the messianic question of Pilate, Barabbas, or the popular demand for his death.

The whole proceeding must have transpired very rapidly, for Jesus is delivered to Pilate early in the morning and he is crucified at 9:00 A.M. The Fourth Gospel has Jesus delivered up for execution " about the sixth hour," noon. (19:14.)

CHAPTER X

GOOD FRIDAY

Scene V

The Crucifixion

GOOD FRIDAY

Scene V. The Crucifixion [a]

	Matthew	Mark	Luke	
1 Simon of Cyrene [b]	27:32	15:21	23:26	
2 *Via Dolorosa*	....	....	27–31	
3 The Crucifixion [c]	33–35	22–25	32–34	
4 Jesus Mocked at the Cross [d]	36–44	26–32	35–39	
5 The Malefactor on the Cross	....	....	40–43	
6 The Death of Jesus [e]	45–50	33–37	44–46	
7 Attendant Signs	51–53	38	....	*Lk 23:45*
8 The Centurion at the Cross	54	39	47	
9 The Grief of the Multitudes	....	....	48	
10 The Galilean Women as Witnesses [f]	55–56	40–41	49	*Lk 8:1–3*
11 The Burial of Jesus [g]	57–60	42–46	50–54	
12 The Galilean Women as Witnesses	61	47	55–56	*Lk 8:1–3*
13 The Watch at the Sepulcher	62–66	....	....	

[a] John 19:17–42.

[b] John 19:17a.

[c] John 19:17b–18, 23–25a.

[d] John 19:19–22.

[e] John 19:28–37.

[f] John 19:25b–27.

[g] John 19:38–42.

MATTHEW and Mark give practically the same account of Jesus' death; they differ only in minor details. Matthew's principal additions are the earthquake (27:51b–53) and the watch at the sepulcher (27:62–66). While Luke has parallels to all the Markan materials in the death scene, he nevertheless seems to be going his own way, giving his own account quite independent of Mark. His principal omissions are the first drink offered Jesus (Mark 15:23) and Mark's only word of Jesus' on the cross (15:34.) Luke adds some new materials: the prophecy over the daughters of Jerusalem (23:27–31), the special scene between Jesus and the dying malefactor (23:40–43), and the presence, sympathy and sorrow of the people (23:27, 35, 48). Most important of all, Luke puts wholly new words on the lips of the dying Jesus. (23:34, 43, 46.)

The Fourth Gospel (19:17–42) has its own account with some familiar matter omitted, some altered, still other matter added that has no parallels in the other Gospels. The Fourth Gospel omits the first drink of Mark (15:23), the mocking at the cross (15:29–31), the darkness at noonday (15:33), the rending of the veil of the temple (15:38) and the confession of the centurion (15:39). He reproduces none of the words ascribed to Jesus on the cross in the first three Gospels. The Fourth Evangelist adds a new scene that centers about the wording of the superscription (19:19–22), the seamless robe (19:23b–24), new witnesses of Jesus' death (19:25–27) and the spear thrust (19:34). On the lips of the dying Jesus he places three wholly new utterances. (19:26–27, 28, 30.)

In the four Gospels we have three different and distinct pictures of the dying Jesus. These divergent pictures are clear in the words ascribed to Jesus on the cross.

In Matthew (27:46) and Mark (15:34) we have one and the same picture of the dying Jesus, one and the same last word:

> "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

According to the first two Gospels, Jesus dies as he has lived, in the throes of severest personal struggle. His one intelligible utterance is the Psalmist's ancient cry of elemental human distress (22:1), mere man in the presence of his Mighty Maker. Such a cry — a prayer of protest — is natural and fits the terrible suffering of body and torture of soul that such a death involved. This picture of Mark is highly realistic — theology cannot do much with it — but certainly it is deeply impressive and true to all that we know of Jesus.

Luke has his own special picture of the dying Jesus. He omits Mark's cry of distress and puts on Jesus' lips three new words, the first and last of which are prayers:

"Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do."
(23:34).
"To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." (23:43.)
"Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." (23:46.)[1]

In Luke Jesus dies calm and composed. With his latest breath he dispenses forgiveness to those who put him to death; he promises a prompt Paradise to a fellow-victim; at the last he calmly commits his spirit to the Father whom he has always trusted. Luke's picture is highly idealistic, yet it too is just as deeply impressive and true to all that we know of Jesus. In Luke Jesus dies as he has lived — loving, forgiving, assured and confident.

There has been a great deal of debate about these two pictures. Usually one (Luke's) has been rejected in favor of the other (Mark's). But the question arises, Are these two pictures mutually exclusive, irreconcilable? On the basis of literary criticism they are, for we have very evidently two different accounts. However, when we approach these two pictures from the standpoint of the psychology of the experience involved, from the point of view of a living and believing personality in its dying hour, they are not necessarily contradictory. The key to these pictures is to be found in the fact that, with one exception, these dying words in the first three Gospels are prayers. In these paradoxical prayers a fundamental psychological law is operating: namely, a tense mental state or feeling may, upon full and spontaneous release, revert into its emotional opposite. The history and psychology of prayer teach us that a state of distress that discharges itself in a protest to God (Mark) may revert for the one who makes it into a state of confidence and composure (Luke). The pictures of the dying Jesus in Matthew and Mark over against that of Luke are companion pieces. Both are true to all that we know of Jesus and his experience of religion. It takes the one to complete the other.

---

[1] On these dying words of Jesus, *see:* Bundy, *The Religion of Jesus,* p. 25 ff; *Our Recovery of Jesus,* p. 315 ff.

The picture of the dying Jesus in the Fourth Gospel stands apart from the twofold picture in the first three Gospels. As in Luke, the Jesus of John dies calm, confident and composed. However, it is not a confidence and composure that is won out of severe religious struggle; it is the pre-human purpose that brought him to this hour that carries him through it. Not one of the three dying words of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel is a prayer. They are all new, colorless, passionless, and they reflect nothing of the actual historical situation in which he finds himself. They are:

> "Woman, behold, thy son!" "Behold, thy mother!" (19:26,27.)
> "I thirst." (19:28.)
> "It is finished." (19:30.)

Such utterances manifest a feeling of superiority to the actual circumstances of crucifixion. They are almost stoical. The Jesus of John dies triumphantly, clearly conscious of the fact that his work has been perfectly done, fully finished. It was not history but theology that gave the Fourth Evangelist his picture of the dying Jesus. But his picture is at least consistent, for he has Jesus die as he has had him live — above all human limitations and conflict, a stranger to genuine human anguish and pain. He departs this life as he has lived it, not a real sharer of our common human experience, for he is just a sojourner on earth, living always in the thought of what was his before the world was and longing to return to it. The Jesus of the Fourth Gospel does not live a real human life, and he does not die a real human death.

1. *SIMON OF CYRENE.*

Matthew 27:32. *Mark* 15:21. *Luke* 23:26.

In the death scene three new characters are introduced. They won for themselves a permanent place in the story because of services rendered or statements made in connection with Jesus' death. The first is Simon of Cyrene who carried Jesus' cross. The second is the unnamed Roman centurion who made his confession at the cross. The third is Joseph of Arimathea who took Jesus' body down from the cross and laid it in a tomb.

Simon of Cyrene appears as a Jew of North Africa. Mark introduces him as the father of Alexander and Rufus, as though these two men were known to the original readers of the second Gospel. He is pressed into service as he is on his way into the city.

Simon of Cyrene does not figure in the Fourth Gospel, according to which Jesus carried his own cross to the place of execution. This notice fits better the Roman practice as we read of it in Roman and Jewish sources outside of the New Testament, in which the condemned victim carries his own cross. The common Christian idea that Jesus started to bear his own cross, fell under the weight of it and that Simon of Cyrene was then pressed into service is a harmonization of these two conflicting notices. This would leave Jesus a weak, worn and exhausted figure, for which conception there is no New Testament basis. We have simply two conflicting reports. According to the first three Gospels, Jesus' cross is carried for him. According to John, he carries it to the place of execution without assistance. The frail, emaciated Jesus of Christian art and conception nowhere appears in the Gospel story.

2. *VIA DOLOROSA.*

Luke 23:27-32.

Luke is the only Gospel writer who reports any words of Jesus on the way to the cross. During these last dramatic scenes, from Gethsemane on, we have had very few utterances of Jesus. These few have been very brief, always within the compass of a single short sentence. But Luke now inserts, between Mark 15:21

and 22, a rather extended prophecy over the Holy City.

Luke's *via dolorosa* is more dramatic than that in the other Gospels. The procession to the cross is followed by a " great multitude of the people, and of women who bewailed and lamented him." (23:27.) Luke alone introduces this sympathetic and grieving public in the death scene. (23:35a, 48.) They have not cried for his blood before Pilate as did the mob in Matthew and Mark. Luke's *via dolorosa* is also more colorful, for he adds the two fellow-victims as a part of the procession to the place of execution. In Matthew and Mark they are not mentioned on the way to the cross.

3. *THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS.*

Matthew 27:33–35. *Mark* 15:22–25. *Luke* 23:33–34.

The place of execution is Golgotha. Its exact location cannot be determined today. An execution within the city limits would have defiled the city and its people. Thus Jesus suffers, as the author of Hebrews says, " without the gate." (13:12.)

In Matthew and Mark the first drink in the death scene is offered Jesus. Luke and the Fourth Evangelist omit this first drink. In Mark Jesus refuses it outright; in Matthew he tastes it and then refuses it. This drink was offered out of humanitarian motives. It was a mixture intended to deaden the nerves of the victim and thus diminish the terrible pain of death by crucifixion. Whether it is offered by the Romans or the Jews is not clear. It does not seem to have been a regular ministration of the Romans to crucified victims. Outside of the New Testament it appears only in cases within Palestine.[2]

The most interesting thing about this benumbing drink is Jesus' refusal of it. It furnishes us one of our finest glimpses into his personality. He does not wish to die with his senses in a stupor. He prefers to remain in clear consciousness. He will fight the last great fight of his life in full possession of his faculties.

Luke mentions the malefactors for a second time. (23:32, 33b.) They are crucified with Jesus. The three crosses form a group with that of Jesus in the center. Matthew and Mark reserve this notice for the mocking scene.

In 23:34 we have Luke's first word of Jesus on the cross, a prayer — "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do." This word is not found in some of the best manuscripts of the third Gospel, and Luke is the only Gospel writer who puts this utterance on the lips of Jesus. Many scholars regard it as a later interpolation, an exemplification of his own teaching on forgiveness. (Luke 6:28.) However, we may not separate the teaching from the teacher. Forgiveness in the experience of Jesus was not just a moral maxim but one phase of the religious spirit for the living of the whole of human life and surrendering it. This tradition of Jesus forgiving his enemies with his latest breath springs up at another point, in the death of Stephen who emulates his Lord. (Acts 7:60.)

---

[2] Cf. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 352.

The clothes of the victim go to the executioners. They cast lots for them. This brief notice in the first three Gospels the Fourth Evangelist develops into a special scene. (19:23–25a.) The garments are divided among four soldiers. The lots are cast for the " seamless robe," mentioned only in the Fourth Gospel, thus fulfilling Psalm 22:18.

Mark tells us that Jesus is crucified at the third hour of the Jewish day, 9:00 A.M. Matthew and Luke omit this notice of time. The Fourth Evangelist is thinking of a later hour, for it is about the sixth hour, noon (19:14), when the Roman trial reaches its final stage. Through this last day of light Mark takes us by periods of three hours: the crucifixion at 9:00 A.M. (15:25); darkness falls at the sixth hour, noon (33); Jesus dies at 3:00 P.M. (34); his body is taken down and laid in a tomb before the close of the Jewish day, 6:00 P.M. (43).

If Jesus' execution had been in the hands of the Jewish authorities he would have been stoned to death, as was Stephen. (Acts 7:54–8:1a.) Crucifixion was a Roman method of carrying out the death penalty. Cicero describes it as cruel and horrifying, Tacitus as utterly despicable. The exact form and method of crucifixion was not fixed but varied considerably as sources outside of the New Testament attest. Our common idea, supported by record, is that of the upright post with the hands tied or nailed to the crossbar, the feet fastened or nailed to the upright. Death for the victim would come slowly. It would result from the sheer exhaustion of shattered nerves and terrible physical pain. Another method of crucifixion is also attested. Just an upright post was used. The hands of the victim were nailed, or fastened otherwise, above the head; the feet were fastened below, resting sometimes lightly on a footboard to relieve the weight of the body from the hands. Death by this method would result more quickly. Breathing would rapidly become more difficult and within a few hours death would result from a process of slow strangulation. The fact that Jesus dies within the space of six hours (Mark 15:25, 34) leads some scholars to think of this latter method of crucifixion in his case. The horrors of such a death — the physical pain, distracted mind, shattered nerves, the sun, the heat, pestering insects — is not to be described. Yet Origen tells us that some crucified victims lived as long as two days. The Gospel writers spare us the horrible details.

4. *JESUS MOCKED AT THE CROSS.*

Matthew 27:36–44. *Mark* 15:26–32. *Luke* 23:35–38.

A mocking of Jesus appears in each of the last three scenes, in both trials and at the cross. Here Jews and Romans seem to join in the mocking. In Matthew and Mark Jesus is mocked with his alleged word about destroying the temple and building it again in three days. This word figured in the Jewish trial in the first two

Gospels.[3] Luke did not report it in the charges before the Sanhedrin, and he omits it here. The taunts are bitter. If Jesus is the Christ, the king of Israel (the Jewish and Roman case against him), let him come down from the cross. He has spoken in paradoxes. Now let him solve his death paradox: he has saved others, himself he cannot save. In Matthew they sit and watch, gloating over his fate (27:36); in Luke (23:35a) it is the people who stand and behold, horrified, in sympathy and grief. Mark has no parallel notice. Luke associates his only drink offered Jesus with this mocking (the vinegar). This is the second drink in Matthew and Mark, but they insert it just ahead of their notice of Jesus' death.

The usual custom was to hang about the victim's neck, or to attach to the cross, a sort of placard stating the nature of the offense or guilt. All four Gospels report this superscription, and common to all four is the reading, "The king of the Jews." Mark's form is briefest; that of the Fourth Gospel longest. It contains about all that we can say with certainty about the case against Jesus. The Fourth Gospel develops a special scene about the reading of the inscription. (19:19–22.) He represents Pilate himself as the author of it, his final jibe at the Jews in this affair. According to the Fourth Gospel, it is written in three languages — Hebrew, Latin and Greek. The chief priests protest against its wording. Then comes Pilate's famous dramatic gesture, " What I have written I have written."

---

[3] Cf. Matt. 26:61b; Mark 14:58; Matt. 24:2b; Mark 13:2b; Luke 21:6b; John 2:19; Acts 6:14a.

The scene closes in Matthew and Mark with the two robbers joining in the mocking of Jesus — a very strange thing for them to do. What their taunts are the first two Gospels do not say.

5. *THE MALEFACTOR ON THE CROSS.*

Luke 23:39-43.

In Luke, however, only one of the two mocks Jesus, " Art not thou the Christ? Save thyself and us." His companion rebukes him, and this leads to the famous scene between Jesus and the dying thief, found only in Luke but a universal element in the Christian story of the death of Jesus. In the malefactor's rebuke to his companion Luke finds another witness of the innocence of Jesus, nor is he the last. The request to be remembered in the kingdom presupposes that the malefactor is acquainted with the substance of Jesus' mission and message. Jesus in his reply, " Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise," promises immediate immortality, not the imminent kingdom as we should expect. This is Luke's second word of Jesus on the cross.

Among the four Gospel writers the Fourth Evangelist has the least interest in these fellow-victims. He simply mentions them as crucified at the same time and place, one on either side (19:18), and the breaking of their legs (19:32). He says nothing of their offense or character;

they do not mock Jesus. It is strange that the latest tradition on this point is the simplest. In Matthew (27:38, 44) and Mark (15:27, 32b) they are crucified immediately after Jesus and they join in the mocking; both are robbers. In Luke they command the greatest interest. He mentions them on the way to the cross (23:32); they are crucified with Jesus rather than immediately after (33b). Their special offense Luke does not mention; they are just evildoers. One remains unrepentant and mocks Jesus; the other repents and would be remembered in the kingdom. (23:39–43.) With this scene the two malefactors disappear from the story in the first three Gospels. Their authors lose interest in them, the time of their death, the circumstances of their removal from the cross and their burial.

6. *THE DEATH OF JESUS.*

Matthew 27:45–50. *Mark* 15:33–37. *Luke* 23:44–46.

In this passage the time moves ahead three and six hours. At the sixth hour, noon, the first of the wonders in connection with Jesus' death in Matthew and Mark takes place — the miraculous darkness at noonday. In all three Gospels it continues for a period of three hours, till three o'clock in the afternoon. Luke groups his wonders in connection with Jesus' death. He brings the strange darkness and the rending of the veil of the temple immediately together and preceding the actual notice of Jesus' death. In the first two Gospels these two miracles are separated:

the darkness comes at noon and continues until three o'clock, but the rending of the veil of the temple comes only at three o'clock and following the notice of Jesus' death.

This miraculous darkness is mythological and belongs to ancient folk-psychology according to which the heavenly bodies participate in human events. They celebrate the birth of the great heroes (as Matthew's star) and they mourn their death. The Fourth Evangelist omits this miraculous darkness in his death scene.

The heart of this passage in Matthew and Mark is omitted by Luke, the death-cry from Psalm 22:1 — Jesus' only intelligible word on the cross in the first two Gospels: " My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? " Luke may have omitted it because of its intolerable implication — Jesus died feeling that he was deserted of the Divine. At least, he puts on Jesus' lips another Psalm passage (35:1) — an expression of trust and confidence. Jesus' only word on the cross in Matthew and Mark is a cry of distress, but it is one of the most impressive utterances from his lips that has come down to us. Jesus dies as he has lived, struggling with his God. He does not abandon his faith in God, but asks why God apparently has deserted him. The key to this cry is the fact that it is a prayer, a prayer of protest. It is not a conscious quotation; the passage simply offers itself to him as the only adequate expression of the hurt of his soul. Luke also omits the misunderstanding that grows out of the cry.

Now comes the second drink in Matthew and Mark, the vinegar. Luke reported it earlier in connection with the mocking (23:36).

The passage closes in Matthew [4] and Mark with the notice of Jesus' death; he dies with a last unintelligible cry. But Luke converts this wordless cry into a prayer of commitment and Jesus surrenders life with another Psalm word on his lips, " Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit " (31:5). The deep distress of a moment before has reverted into confidence and composure of soul — a psychological process that often appears in the history of prayer and prayer-literature.

The Fourth Evangelist has the vinegar offered in response to Jesus' word, "I thirst." (19:28–29.) But the Johannine Jesus is not really thirsty. He speaks this word only in order that the Scripture may be fulfilled. (Ps. 69:21.) Like Luke he omits the cry of distress and the misunderstanding of the bystanders reported by Matthew and Mark. He also omits the last loud cry of the first two Gospels and has Jesus surrender his spirit with the triumphant word, " It is finished." (19:30.)

7. *ATTENDANT SIGNS.*

Matthew 27:51–53. *Mark* 15:38.

In Matthew and Mark the miraculous darkness and the rending of the veil of the temple are distinct, the latter following immediately upon Jesus' death as though a result of it. In this rending of the veil of the temple, omitted by the Fourth Gospel and associated with the mysterious noonday darkness in Luke, we have to do with religious symbolism. Now the last barrier between God and man is broken down, a theme that is elaborated in Ephesians 2:14–18; Hebrews 9:1–12; 10: 19–25.

---

[4] Some manuscripts of Matthew 27:50 add the spear-thrust and the issue of water and blood. Cf. John 19:34.

Matthew greatly elaborates on the wondrous signs that attended Jesus' death. He introduces an earthquake, a rending of the rocks, the opening of tombs, the resurrection of saints and their appearance to many in the city. (27:51b–53.) Matthew also introduces an earthquake in his Easter story. (28:2.) All of these strange things simply say that with the death of Jesus all that Christians hope and believe is realized.

8. *THE CENTURION AT THE CROSS.*

Matthew 27:54. *Mark* 15:39. *Luke* 23:47.

The second new character in the death scene is now introduced, the centurion in command of the execution. He is not mentioned in the Fourth Gospel; even the first three Gospels do not give his name. Only later, in the Gospel of Peter, is his name given, Petronius. In Mark and Luke only the centurion confesses, but in Matthew the soldiers under him also confess. In Matthew and Mark we seem to have a full-fledged Christian confession: "Truly this man was the Son of God." In Luke, however, the centurion is just another witness to Jesus' innocence:

"Certainly this was a righteous man." In Matthew and Luke the wondrous events — the noonday darkness, the earthquake (Matthew) — seem to prompt the confession. But in Mark it is the manner in which Jesus dies, "that he so gave up the ghost," that compels the confession. Just all that Mark's "so" implies is not clear, but certainly Jesus' prayer of protest and the last loud cry are dramatic enough to impress any witness.

9. *THE GRIEF OF THE MULTITUDES.*

Luke 23:48.

With this notice Luke dismisses the sympathetic public from the scene. They came with Jesus over the *via dolorosa,* bewailing his fate (23:27); they stood beholding while the rulers scoffed (35); now they return, smiting their breasts. This general public demonstration of grief is found only in Luke. Loved of the people from the beginning, he is loved to the end. Such is Luke's picture. Jesus has always enjoyed general public favor; now the people mourn his death. In one manuscript (Syr.$^{\text{sin}}$) this public grief breaks into words: "And they said, Woe to us, what has happened to us, woe to us, because of our sin."

10. *THE GALILEAN WOMEN AS WITNESSES.*

Matthew 27:55-56. *Mark* 15:40-41. *Luke* 23:49.

Here at the very close of the Gospel story in Matthew and Mark we hear of these women for the first time. Luke, however, mentioned them in the course of his Galilean account where we should have expected to hear of them in the first two Gospels. Luke does not name the women in this connection. He simply refers to them as a group already named in 8:1–3. These women, like Jesus and his disciples, are Passover pilgrims. Luke refers to the presence also of Jesus' acquaintance.

These women are introduced here as witnesses of Jesus' death. In the first three Gospels none of the intimate group of twelve is present. The twelve dropped out of the story at the scene of the arrest, Judas with his betrayal and Simon with his denial. Thus our knowledge of these closing scenes, especially the death scene, is entirely dependent upon what these women remembered of what they heard and saw. They occupy, then, a very important place in the transmitted story of Jesus. Our indebtedness to these women may extend far beyond these closing passages. Their witness may be at the base of much that belongs to the general body of the story, especially certain passages that are found only in Luke.

The Fourth Gospel (19:25b) tells us that Jesus' own mother (without her name) and the beloved disciple were there, not afar off but at the very foot of the cross. The first word on the cross in the Fourth Gospel is addressed to his mother, "Woman, behold, thy son," and to this beloved disciple, "Behold, thy mother." (19:26–27.) The first three Gospels know nothing of this mysterious beloved disciple at any point in their story, and it is strange that they should have overlooked the presence of Jesus' mother at the cross had she really been there.

11. *THE BURIAL OF JESUS.*

Matthew 27:57–60. *Mark* 15:42–46. *Luke* 23:50–54.

The third new character in the death scene now appears, Joseph of Arimathea who won for himself a permanent place in the story of Jesus because he took down the body and laid it in a tomb. Mark and Luke seem to think of him as a member of the Sanhedrin, and Luke hastens to assure his readers that Joseph had not joined in the Jewish verdict against Jesus although he seems to think of him as present at the Jewish trial. Matthew adds that he is rich. What Joseph's interest in and relation to Jesus were is not clear. Was he a disciple of Jesus? Matthew speaks of him as such. Mark and Luke say that he is looking for the kingdom of God, the equivalent apparently of discipleship. Some are of the opinion that Joseph's interest is not in Jesus at all, but in the Sabbath, that it be not defiled by bodies of dead victims hanging beyond sunset. (Deut. 21:23.) But if Joseph's interest is purely Jewish, why does he not care for the bodies of the thieves — if they are dead?

According to all three Gospels Joseph goes to Pilate and requests the grant of Jesus' body. The surprise of Pilate that death has come so quickly and the calling of the centurion for confirmation are reported only by Mark among the first three Gospels. In Mark Joseph takes Jesus' body down and lays it in a tomb with a stone at the door. Luke says it is a new, unused tomb; Matthew adds that it belonged to Joseph. Down to this point there is no mention of the tomb being sealed or of a guard of Roman soldiers set to watch.

In the first three Gospels the body of Jesus is not prepared for burial. It is not left in its final resting state or place. There is not time for such; the Sabbath is too near (Mark 15:42). It is the preparation of the body that brings the women to the tomb early on the first day of the week (Mark and Luke).

The Fourth Gospel has its own account of the burial. It is the Jews who request that all the bodies be taken down in order that the approaching Sabbath and festival be not defiled. The soldiers take the bodies down. The two fellow-victims are not yet dead, so their legs are broken. But Jesus is dead already and they do not break his legs. (Ex. 12:46; Num. 9:12.) To make sure, one of the soldiers pierces Jesus' side with a spear. There issues from the wound water and blood. (Zech. 12:10.) It is only at this point that Joseph appears in the Fourth Gospel. He does go to Pilate, but he does not take the body of Jesus down from the cross. He is a disciple of Jesus but fear of the Jews keeps him from public confession. Joseph in the Fourth Gospel is not alone in burying Jesus; he is assisted by Nicodemus. (3:1–18; 7:50–51.) Together they prepare Jesus' body for burial. It is in its final resting state and place. The tomb is in a nearby garden, new and unused.

12. *THE GALILEAN WOMEN AS WITNESSES.*

Matthew 27:61. *Mark* 15:47. *Luke* 23:55–56.

For the second time in the death scene the Galilean women are introduced, again as witnesses, this time of the burial. This prepares the way for the early morning visit at the tomb.

13. *THE WATCH AT THE SEPULCHER.*

Matthew 27:62–66.

Thus far we have heard only of Jesus' body being laid in a tomb and a stone rolled to the door. This is the simplest and earliest tradition. Now we hear how all sorts of precautions are taken — the tomb is sealed and a guard of soldiers is set to prevent a theft of the body. The time given here is the day following Jesus' death. The hearty cooperation between Pilate and the Jewish authorities is surprising. The sealed tomb and the Roman guard figure nowhere in the resurrection reports except in Matthew who makes the guard witness the earthquake on the Easter morning, the descent of the angel and the rolling away of the stone. (28:1–4.) The passage here has its sequel in Matthew 28:11–15 where the guard is bribed to silence or falsehood by the chief priests. In this passage Matthew is looking ahead and it relates itself to what is to come rather than to what precedes.

This passage belongs to early Christian apologetics. It is a reply to the charge that the resurrection was a fraud, that Jesus' disciples stole his body from the tomb and then announced him as risen from the dead. It belongs then to the Easter tradition rather than to the story of Jesus. It is a piece of Easter controversy. The type of Easter faith herein represented is not of a very high order. It seems unable to exist without a full assurance of the tomb being empty.

EPILOGUE

THE EASTER ADVERSATIVE

THE story of Jesus has a strange sequel. The tale that began in Galilee and that seemed to end with the tragedy in Jerusalem has an epilogue. At Jesus' death there is only a temporary halt. The story goes on. It continues indefinitely. The reader has been following Jesus step by step through an extremely local geographical and historical setting. But now his vision is lifted from time and place. The narrow horizon recedes and the new prospect appears. The mission of a prophet of God becomes a religious movement with a world outlook and plan. The story of Jesus does not come to a formal ending. The resurrection reports by their very genius seek their final culmination across centuries in eternity itself. The limits of a particular life are transcended.

While the Easter faith forms the pulse of the New Testament documents and the Christian experience from which they came, it is at only a few points within the New Testament itself that this fervent conviction halts to give a meager, all too meager, account of itself and the circumstances of its origin. The principal points come in the concluding chapter of each of the first three Gospels, in the last two chapters of the Fourth Gospel, in the first eleven verses of the book of Acts and in Paul's list of appearances of the Risen Lord to individuals and groups in I Corinthians 15:5–8.

These New Testament reports of the resurrection fall into two natural groups or strains of tradition. The first strain speaks only of appearances to the disciples and others. This strain is represented in all of the reports. The second strain tells of the visit of the women to the tomb, how they found it empty and were informed in a vision of angels that Jesus had risen from the dead and would manifest himself to his disciples. This second strain is found only in the Gospels where it prefaces the appearances to the disciples.

Our earliest literary record of the Easter experiences comes from the hand of Paul (I Cor. 15:5–8), who is the arch-resurrectionist of the New Testament. Paul's Easter faith is the most constant theme in all that he writes. It is never far below the surface and is always discernible. Yet how poor and meager are his hints relative to the circumstances of the origin and development of this one cardinal conviction that commanded him. The details of his Easter vision are the work of another, the author of Acts (9:1–9; 22:6–11; 26:12–18.) Paul himself is content to use just simple brief phrases: "He appeared to me also" (I Cor. 15:8), "It was the good pleasure of God . . . to reveal his Son in me" (Gal 1:15–16). Paul's Easter faith is to be described as elemental. He has no disposition to elaborate on details, yet he is always firm in his assertion that he saw the Risen Lord. It is especially interesting and important to note that the visit of the women to the tomb and their discovery that it is empy do not appear either in the foundations or in the superstructure of Paul's Easter faith. At no point does he allude to the sepulcher story.

In the Christian experience of Paul, then, we have the Easter faith not only in its earliest but in its finest form. It seems to rest quite surely on visionary matter, but there is no disposition toward detail and minute delineation, no seeking for a setting in time and place. It appears as an inner certainty that seeks no objective supports in such items as the empty tomb. Paul's Easter faith takes on the form of a dominant life-conviction. Paul is convinced, and he remains convinced. For this faith he is ready to stake his all. We may call it assertion or assumption, but in its Pauline form the Easter faith ranges itself in the ranks of the respectable and resourceful phenomena in the history and psychology of religion. In its light the Apostle lived and worked, wrought and taught, preached and prayed, believed and hoped and died. This is about the maximum that religious faith in any of its many forms seems to be able to do for men.

When we turn from the primitive, elemental Easter faith of Paul to the resurrection reports of the Gospels, we realize at once that we have to do with a wholly different type. Here the simple statements do not suffice and we find detailed and divergent accounts of the circumstances under which the new faith arose, and these circumstances are used as proofs of this faith's essential truth. We have not merely an Easter faith that rests upon appearances to the disciples and others but upon the tradition of the empty tomb. Here we meet not just simple assertion and assumption, but apologetic; the Easter faith is not only set forth but it is defended. This very fact shows that the resurrection chapters of the Gospels belong to a later and secondary stage of this faith's development. It is not of such a high and fine order, for it seeks external supports which are assembled into a defense. Religious faith of any sort is always more impressive and convincing when it simply asserts and assumes than when it seeks to posit and prove.

No section of the New Testament perhaps is more unsatisfactory from the standpoint of actual information conveyed than the resurrection chapters that conclude the Gospels. There is no unity in this Easter tradition either in general or in detail. There is a great difference in the materials as well as great difference in the treatment of the same materials. The reports of particular items are confused and conflicting. No really consistent account of the tomb tradition or of the appearances can be pieced together.

Suppose we turn to the sepulcher story. In Mark three women, all named, visit the tomb. In Matthew there are only two women. In Luke three are named and others, unnamed, are with them. In the Fourth Gospel Mary Magdalene is alone. In Mark they go " very early "; in Matthew, as it " began to dawn "; in Luke, " at early dawn"; in John, Mary Magdalene goes "while it is yet dark." In Matthew an angel descends from heaven and rolls away the stone from the tomb; the women witness it. In the other three Gospels they find the stone already removed. In all four Gospels the women see a vision of angels. In Matthew and Mark there is but one angel; in Luke and John there are two. In Matthew and Mark the women receive a commission from the angel. They are to instruct the disciples to go to Galilee where they shall see their Lord. In Luke there is no such instruction to depart for Galilee and the angels simply remind the women of what Jesus said while he was still in Galilee. In the Fourth Gospel there is no commission from the angels but from the Risen Lord himself. Mary Magdalene is to announce to the disciples that Jesus ascends to the Father. Mark and Luke have no accounts of appearances of the Risen Lord to the women. In Matthew he appears to them and repeats the commission of the angel. In John Mary Magdalene first mistakes the strange figure for the gardener, but on hearing her own name she recognizes her Teacher. In Matthew the women grasp the feet of the Risen Lord and worship him; in John Mary Magdalene is forbidden to touch, for he has not yet ascended to the Father. In Mark the women do not carry out their commission; they are filled with fear and remain silent. In Matthew their emotions are mingled, "fear and great joy," and they hasten to tell the disciples. In Luke they report to the disciples without a special commission to do so.

Mary Magdalene in the Fourth Gospel tells the disciples of her vision and the Lord's words. In Luke (24:12) Peter goes to confirm this rumor of the empty tomb; in the Fourth Gospel he is accompanied by the beloved disciple and together they find the tomb empty as Mary Magdalene has said. In Matthew and Mark there is no effort to confirm the report of the empty tomb. From such great divergence and conflict in details we can gather only the general gist of the sepulcher story: The tomb was found empty by the women. The conclusion is: therefore, Jesus must have risen from the dead. The visions of the disciples and others were not delusions.

The Gospel accounts of the appearances of the Risen Lord center upon Jesus' chosen group, the eleven or twelve. Only Matthew and John report an appearance to the women. Luke (24:34) alone among the Gospel writers refers to an appearance to Simon. (I Cor. 15:5.) But the most elaborate and charming of all the Easter stories is found only in Luke — the appearance to the disciples of Emmaus. (24:13–35.) The other Easter appearances listed by Paul (I Cor. 15:5–8) — to the five hundred, all the apostles, James and Paul himself — are not even referred to in the Gospels reports.

The Easter experience of the twelve, or eleven, is the only appearance common to all of the New Testament resurrection traditions, yet the accounts of it differ and conflict both in general features and in details fully as much as do the stories of the discovery of the empty tomb. The first great surprise that strikes us is that the Gospel of Mark comes to an abrupt end with 16:8 with an appearance promised but unfulfilled. This abrupt close has aroused speculation and debate. Was Mark hindered from completing his work? Did he complete it and later the end was severed and lost? Or, is not 16:1–8 a real ending and all that we might reasonably expect? However one may answer these questions, certainly the present ending (16:9–20), as well as another shorter one, is of relatively late origin and composed of extracts from the resurrection reports of Matthew, Luke, John and Acts.

A second thing that surprises us is a split in the tradition relative to the scene of this appearance to the twelve. Mark 16:1–8 points to Galilee, and Matthew sets the scene on a mountain in Galilee (28:16–17). Luke, both in his Gospel and in Acts, thinks of all the appearances, whether to the twelve or others, as having their scene in and about Jerusalem. In chapter 20 of the Fourth Gospel the scene is Jerusalem, but in the appendix chapter (21) the scene is Galilee. Historical research favors Galilee, for the northern province with its former associations as the principal scene of Jesus' activity and the twelve's experience in his company furnished the natural psychic soil for the Easter visions of this intimate group. Further, by keeping the disciples in Jerusalem, Luke is preparing the setting for the events of the early chapters of Acts, particularly Pentecost.

When we come to the appearances themselves we find the same conflicts in the materials and their treatment that we found in the tomb tradition. Matthew (28:16–17) goes into no detail concerning the manner of the appearance: the twelve see and worship him, yet some doubt. Matthew's interest centers on the words of the Risen Lord — the great missionary command, the baptismal formula and the promise of his eternal presence with his disciples. (28:18–20.) Luke's appearance to the disciples (24:36–43) is of a very different order. He seems interested in the disciples' reactions, particularly their emotions — fear, skepticism, unbelief and, eventually, joy. The chief concern in Luke's account seems to be to overcome the idea that the disciples have seen an apparition or a ghost. The Risen Lord is not a spirit, for he has flesh and bones; he exhibits his wounded hands and feet; he eats in their presence. His words point out his resurrection as a fulfilment of Scripture. The disciples are not dismissed at once on a world mission. They must first tarry in Jerusalem until they are clothed with power from on high (Pentecost). Luke alone reports the ascension. (24:50–52; Acts 1:9–11; Mark 16:19.) In the Fourth Gospel there are two appearances to the intimate group. The first comes in 20:19–23. The Risen Lord appears mysteriously, passing through closed doors, yet he exhibits his hands and his side. He breathes on them the Holy Spirit, the Johannine Pentecost. The second appearance comes eight days later. (20:24–29.) We learn for the first time that Thomas was not present on the former occasion. This second appearance is in its general character simply a repetition of the first. Its special purpose is to overcome the unbelief of Thomas and to idealize the type of Easter faith that has not seen yet has believed. The story of the appearance in the appendix chapter (21) is composite. The scene is the sea of Galilee with a heterogeneous group of witnesses — some are from the circle of the twelve; others are not. This appearance does not presuppose those in chapter 20. Its interest centers on Simon Peter and the beloved disciple. The first is reclaimed after his shameful denial and there is a mysterious promise to the second about tarrying till the Risen Lord returns.

Among other possible accounts of the Easter experience of the twelve must be reckoned the story of the transfiguration [1] and the walking on the water,[2] for both have closer affinities in general character and in detail with the Easter experiences than with historical incidents during Jesus' lifetime. Relics of the story of the reclaiming of Simon Peter, evidently a part of the Easter experience of this disciple, seem to have deposited themselves in Luke's account of the calling of the first fishermen. (5:1–11.)

These are strange stories — all of them. They are strange to our ways of thinking, to our manner of conception. In view of the tremendous religious movement that grew out of the central conviction at their heart, they are hardly satisfactory from any angle of inquiry. They give us no intelligible insight into the forces and factors that produced the Easter faith. The setting presented is hardly commensurate with the importance of what followed. These traditions are fearfully feeble as a foundation for a great world religion. The Easter faith existed long before these particular traditions were circulated, and when one realizes the vigor and vitality of the Easter faith in the experience of a man like Paul these traditions appear as wholly inadequate, whether as accounts of its origin or as defenses of its truth. Paul's simpler assumptions and assertions are more impressive.

---

[1] Matt. 17:1–8; Mark 9:2–8; Luke 9:28–36a.

[2] Matt. 14:23b–33; Mark 6:47–52.

How then shall we approach these Easter traditions, for the discovery of any values that they have to offer depends upon an adequate approach to what they relate and what they seek to communicate?

THE HISTORICAL APPROACH.

From the strictly historical point of view the resurrection reports do not belong to the life of Jesus. The history of any man is concluded with an account of his death and burial. This marks the end; there is no historical continuation. Whatever movement may follow upon the man's life and work, no matter how closely it may associate itself with his spirit and name, the story of the man himself as an actor in history is closed. The movement that follows marks a new beginning which the historian may follow as he followed the man through his life and work.

For the historian, then, the resurrection reports belong to the beginnings and earliest history of Christianity. In them we have the rise of a new faith, not necessarily the organic continuation of the faith of the Man who died on the cross. The historian can gather out of these reports only one principal point and fact: namely, the belief in the resurrection of Jesus on the part of the earliest Christians. This one belief is the most distinctive feature of the new faith. What the reports present may not be regarded as historical happenings. The original fact was the Easter faith, and these reports are its products. In them this new faith seeks a setting in time and place, in concrete conditions and circumstances.

The historian distinguishes very sharply between the resurrection of Jesus and the early Christian belief in his resurrection. The latter is a simple fact of history attested in many ways. The former, however, transcends the pale of history. Death is the last verifiable fact; beyond death, there is no verification in the sense of history. Out of the resurrection reports, then, the historian sifts a single fact — the belief in Jesus' resurrection. What was back of this belief, and its validity, are not his problems. An actual resurrection he can never affirm, for history halts at the death notice so far as any particular human life is concerned.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH.

The psychologist can go a step farther than the historian who must stop with the fact of the belief in Jesus' resurrection. The psychologist deals with human experience, and the belief in Jesus' resurrection offers an interesting psychological fact. It is the task of the psychologist to analyze human beliefs, to locate their origin in experience, to trace their development and to delineate their substance, particularly those beliefs that have been commanding in the lives of individuals and groups and that have produced far-reaching results.

The resurrection reports belong to the field of the psychology of religious experience rather than to the field of historical documents. They escape us as statements of historical fact beyond that of the early Christian belief in Jesus' resurrection. They are primarily assertions of religious faith. In them we are not dealing with history but with religious experience, primitive Christian experience, a powerful faith giving a feeble account of the circumstances of its origin and equally feeble defenses of its truth.

The resurrection reports offer a veritable variety of Easter faith and experience. The conflicts and confusions, both in general features and in details, come more from the divergent types of Easter experience represented than from differences and departures in the transmission of the Easter story. One type seeks out the empty tomb; another is not even interested in such. One type seeks external supports; the other rests on inner conviction and ventures out to bold assertion. One type recognizes its Object at once; another has the same Object in an at first concealed identity — a peculiar mannerism discloses it. One type embraces its Object; the other says, "Touch not." One type must assure itself that this is no apparition — the figure is the same, real flesh and bones; the scars are in their places; the Lord eats in its presence. The other type dispenses with all of these objective proofs; it reaches its certainty without them; it listens to the commissions placed upon it. There are the mingled and confused emotions: fear and joy, timidity and boldness, belief and doubt.

The psychologist will find, too, that the resurrection reports do not belong to the story of a human historical figure. With them a new drama begins, a drama that seemed to grow out of it, but a tremendous transformation has taken place. The theme no longer centers about the earthly Jesus who died for his faith but around the heavenly Christ who is this Jesus risen from the dead. Throughout the resurrection reports Jesus is the object of the new faith; as a religious object his person is its distinctive feature. The attitude of Jesus' followers has undergone a complete transformation: formerly they followed him; now they worship him in the full sense of religious faith and reverence. Their whole experience rallies around this new center.

Back of all this the psychologist will find the Easter visions, only the general gist of which he is able to gather. In their form they belong to that visionary type of experience so common in the history and psychology of religion. As their distinctive and essential substance appears the conviction that this Jesus who died on the cross God has raised from the dead and they have seen him. Back of these visions, too, the psychologist will find a turmoil of emotions called forth by the tragic events: disappointed hopes, unfulfilled faith, distress, sorrow, despair followed by remembered love and devotion, tender recollections, gradually restored confidence and composure, a rekindled faith, a fresh rush of hope that turns into certainty. It cannot be so! He is not dead! He is with us!

But with all this the psychologist has not demonstrated the resurrection of Jesus, and he knows it. He has only sought to analyze the belief in the resurrection of Jesus as it seems to have appeared and founded itself in the experience of the disciples. The psychologist cannot go much beyond this without ceasing to be a psychologist and becoming an adherent of the Easter faith.

One other service the psychologist can render. He can evaluate the Easter faith in the terms of what it was able to accomplish in the experience of those who entertained it. He cannot go back beyond the belief in the resurrection of Jesus, but he can say that there must have been some tremendously solid substance in and behind the Easter faith, for it was the source of seemingly limitless enthusiasm and energy. It represented a great body of religious conviction and certainty. It was utterly commanding for those who were held by it. In the light of it they lived and worked and died. The psychologist may say that he finds it inconceivable that men like Paul, that a religious movement like Christianity, could stake everything on an empty delusion. What actually happened the psychologist cannot say. How valid the Easter faith was and is he will not venture to state. But he recognizes in the earliest Christian belief in Jesus' resurrection an elemental human conviction that was capable of commanding men and movements, of enlisting them in its service, even over long periods of time.

THE RELIGIOUS APPROACH.

The resurrection reports belong to the realm of religious faith. In them only a very limited amount of historical fact is discoverable. At their heart we find powerful religious convictions, religious assumptions and assertions. Religious faith is a peculiar thing in human experience. It does not proceed like other psychic processes in every respect. It does not always await the confirmation of fact, the demonstration of reason and logic. Often it deliberately ignores all of these things. Without a single historical or logical support, often in defiance of all such considerations, it will launch out on its own venture with the utmost assurance and confidence. In reality, religious faith appears at its best when it bids defiance, if necessary, to all that the human situation offers and goes its own way, learning and living in the light of its assumptions and assertions. It is a strange thing in the history of religion that the most powerful religious personalities have been sheer venturers who showed little or no interest in strict history, reason or logic.

The Easter faith, then, is a sheer venture of the religious spirit. In spite of death as the last verifiable fact, the earliest Christians believed in the resurrection of Jesus in particular, and men before and since in immortality in general. The resurrection of Jesus and human immortality can never be demonstrated satisfactorily. All the verifiable facts are against both, and both must remain what they have been from the outset — sheer assumptions and assertions. These assumptions and assertions may be regarded as valid if they offer an actual substance that the believing subject can live and work by. They are true if they enrich, enhance and elevate, if they produce a high quality of personal character and social living.

Just what happened, just what the Easter experiences of the disciples were, we do not know. The exact circumstances and the original conditions out of which the Easter faith appeared and developed cannot be determined by us. The original witnesses, Paul included, seemed better able to declare their Easter faith than they were to account for it or to describe its origin. This strange faith seems to have held its subjects closer to its heart than to its history. There is a fine reserve and restraint in the resurrection reports. The resurrection itself is not described. We have simply an announcement of a conviction. There appears only the firm and fervent faith that Jesus lives again.

The resurrection reports may not be used to prove the resurrection of Jesus in particular or the thesis of immortality in general. They are a witness of faith, nothing more. They testify to just one thing — the Easter conviction of the earliest Christians. They are the early Christian answer to the cross, *faith's great adversative.* Fact halts at Jesus' death, but faith ventures on. Fact says that he was crucified, dead and buried. Faith replies that *he is not dead, but liveth.* And Jesus does live on in human history and experience in a sense and significance that no other human being before or after him does, in a meaning that even the resurrection reports taken as literal history could never supply. Taken as documents of faith, the resurrection reports convey an elemental human conviction: men may be snatched from the scene of human history, *but* men like Jesus never die. This was not the special meaning of the Easter faith for the original experients, but this faith and its witnesses do convey at least this much to us.

The religious significance of Jesus in no wise depends upon whether he did or did not rise from the dead. The formal doctrine of the resurrection can never again be central in determining the modern meaning of Jesus. In the light of all that we know of him, the reliability of the tradition of the empty tomb, the witness of the women and the appearances to the disciples and others become insignificant. Any modern meaning, any really religious significance, of Jesus must be sought in the living centers of his historical personality, in the fundamental truths that he lived and died by, in the reliability of his exclusively religious approach to all that our human life and experience offer.

If we approach the whole question of immortality as Jesus seems to have approached it (and he has surprisingly little to say on this theme in a formal way) there is no great difficulty in the way of religious faith believing in his resurrection. Jesus spoke of a future that is wholly God's and that is destined for those who attain religiously in the present. Jesus attained as none before or after him. Meager as our information is about him, we nevertheless see in him the richest single deposit of religious values known to our human experience. If we are to believe in the resurrection of anyone, we must believe first in the resurrection of Jesus. Eternal life with the Father whom he preached and to whom he prayed is the only fitting fate for the historical personality of Jesus.

The traditional Christian belief in immortality has often been too flippant in its assumptions and assertions with too little realization of the utter seriousness of the thing involved. Jesus spoke of eternal life in the terms of the creation of permanent values, of " laying up treasures " that perish not. Such an approach is searching, for it confronts us with the question: What values do we possess or represent that we can honestly recommend, even to ourselves in our best moments, as worthy of eternal endurance? Such a question strips us of all excess confidence and assurance. It sobers us. It tears the egotism of human merit from under us and it places the hope of divine mercy above us.

In its finest form there will always be at the heart of the Easter faith, in all of its implications, something more elemental and vital than the formal doctrines and dogmas can give. Immortality for Jesus and others, at its best, will always be a humble human hope that dares venture upon the Now and the Then in the light, on the scale and scope, of all that such a humble human hope has to offer.

The Gospel story closes with one of the most powerful paradoxes of piety. He lived; he died — BUT — This is the great Easter adversative.

Date Due

~~MAR 31 1983~~

~~MAY 6 1992~~

~~SEP 28 '66~~

1eB/75

BS2425 .B94
The passion week,
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00013 2904